Book 4

[originally published as Book 26 of the Serial *Völkisches Erwachen*/*Folkish Awakening*]

The formation of the Roman universal church

Introduction

The necessity of historical-critical logic

To not be understood is by no means the destined privilege of philosophers; it can happen to a history critic, too, to be thoroughly misunderstood. Such as myself, for example. Now, if such stubborn misunderstanding extends especially to the utmost important thing, the foundation of my critical investigations, namely the *method*, then, even harmless slow-wittedness must not remain quite unruffled. Or am I perhaps the cause for the misunderstanding of my new method's nature? I think no reader can accuse me of this, since I have time and again, whenever an opportunity arose, discussed right thoroughly and by clarifying allegories, just what my investigation method is all about. For example, several times, I called my procedure the method of sound common sense. Right away, one of these superficial critics retorts: "One knows of course, how often so-called 'sound common sense' has erred during the course of history (just think of various technical advancements: trains, planes etc.)" My naive critic proves by these omissions, that he has not understood the first thing about the nature of my critical method. With some good will and a little reasoning activity, it should occur to even the most shiftless amateur, that regarding my procedure, there could have never been, nor could be, any talk of the application of sound common sense to technical or scientific possibilities or impossibilities. Did I ever speak of *physical* possibilities? I have stressed again and again: *psychological* possibilities are being discussed! So, for notorious misunderstanders, the following tip again: A) Physical impossibility. Here, I say, that nothing is impossible in the physical world (as long as it does not conflict with a law of nature). B) Psychological impossibility. Here, I say, on the basis of experience, that in the mental world (in the human psyche), certain things are impossible (e.g. that a normal "practical" forger fully deliberately copies his model source inaccurately!). He who is unable to grasp this difference between possibilities within the physical and psychological world, can unfortunately not be helped by any human means.

Other experiences are prompting me to give a lecture on history-critical logic as soon as possible. One slogan that sounded several times from across, since the publication of my last books (*Mystery Rome in the Middle Ages* and *Dogmatic Christianity and History Falsification*), was: pertinacity! According to this, I have allegedly been so pertinacious about my "hypothesis" of the systematic falsification of medieval history, that I am "blind to anything contradicting". So, I am considered an utterly critiqueless critic!! Some level-headed ones are shaking their heads particularly over the fact, that for the epoch of the 14th century, I dare speak out carefreely and naturally: this is genuine historical tradition, and that is falsification, or even plain invention. If the history of the 14th century has been systematically falsified now, then how is it possible – so one asks – to carry out any sifting into the historically true and false at all? If, in this distinction, I proceeded arbitrarily, or on the basis of some prejudices or allowances, then, my cause would be an outrage on truth and on history. So, my critical activity requires a justification, i.e. I have the obligation to demonstrate that neither

arbitrariness nor prejudice are the driving force of my critical work. My verdicts of acknowledgement or rejection must be necessary, they must be dictated by the imperative necessity of history-critical logic.

He who wants to understand my conduct of evidence, or wants to recognise as necessary my sifting into the historically true and false, has to think axiomatically. What does that mean? Their critical starting point must be an axiom (or a multiple of axioms), i.e. a from living experience taken *psychological fundamental truth*. In my previous books, I have highlighted a whole series of such fundamental truths, and thus equally created firm islands in a swampy territory. Now, such axiomatic fundamental truth is no dead mass, but represents a living organism of spirit, a concentrated, logical force field, from which, towards all sides, "conclusions" radiate. With each detected central truth (of the psychological kind), one gains a fixed Archimedean point in the swamp territory of falsified tradition, and from that psychological basis, one is able to unhinge entire complexes of alleged historical "facts" as opposing the central truth, i.e. to declare them for unauthentic. To name an example: if I have established (in *Mystery Rome*), that popedom's alleged Avignonian exile is impossible for religious-psychological reasons, then, from this axiom, it *follows* with logical necessity, that thousands and thousands of *contradicting* details of the written tradition *must* be falsified. No truthful mind can and will resist this historical-critical consequence, because it steps up with the same hard necessity as a mathematical conclusion. So, what is being reprimanded as "pertinacity", is merely the acceptance of an inescapable historical-critical consequence. And it is just that, which shows the scientific truthfulness of a critic, that he does not cowardly shy back from any necessary conclusion.

The question: is it even possible at all to retrieve *authentic* parts from the muddle of falsified history? is, with the above description, answered affirmatively. So, the separation procedure of the tradition into authentic and unauthentic parts is possible, and it is executed "by itself", i.e. with logical necessity from the process of psychological-axiomatic thinking. Not arbitrariness is at work, but the axiomatic reagent forces create the historic-authentic precipitation in the murky mass of the falsified tradition. It has to be explicitly stressed however, that it can only ever be achieved to trace genuine history in its *large basic outlines*. The more one wants to turn to critically observing the thousand *details* of the tradition structure, the more the individual details vanish in the fog of the systematic falsification. Axiomatic thinking thus also means something else: think relevant.

For the reader's kind consideration, it shall still be mentioned that this here Book forms a critical unit together with the two previous ones (*Mystery Rome in the Middle Ages* and *Dogmatic Christianity and History Falsification*). Regarding the great late medieval falsification action, these three books overall present the root cause of that action. They answer the question: why was the Roman universal church, founded at the beginning of the 15th century at the so-called reform councils, forced to systematically re-forge medieval overall history according to a certain blueprint?

1. The religious-political main problems of the 14th century

"The French national church intervenes in European politics." With this fact in the last chapter of the previous Book *Dogmatic Christianity and History Falsification*, I have thrown a light upon the *root cause* of all significant clerical-religious and secular-political events of the beginning 14th century. If we call the unity of the in the French national church comprised three big power systems (church – state – science) Gallicanism, then we can designate the course of the history of the entire 14th century as the under constant fighting pursued transformation of Gallicanism into *Romanism*, wherein, under the latter designation, we perceive the idea of a Roman-catholic universal church with a universal pope.

The French national church could pride itself for its first big success as a pan-folkish power, when it succeeded, by the purposeful utilisation of French money in Western Germany, among other things, in lifting the three-quarter-Frenchman Henry of Luxemburg onto the German King's throne. Henry (VII.) was chosen, as the tool of the French national popedom, to build a road to the future victory of the French dogma in Germany, and primarily in Italy. Henry's fight against the church enemies in Italy ended in a draw, the "messenger of God and pope Clemens" departed from the middle of the fight by an early death. The critical investigations of the last Book had lead us up to this point in time. And at this point, we continue our thorough research of the falsified tradition of the 14th century.

After Henry's death, the German people had once again been gifted with a *double Kingdom*. The one party of the Elector Princes elected the Duke Ludwig of Upper Bavaria, the other party elected Duke Frederic the Handsome of Austria.

All secular politics of the 14th century, too, is either already, in its most inner core of motives, church politics, or it will very soon inescapably be dragged into the dogmatic-clerical vortex. Since the beginning of the century, the priesthood of the individual religious churches more and more makes the secular relations its home: the help of the "secular arm" is secured for the assertion of a dogma.

If we now ask: which religious fighting groups found their power-political expression in the split election Frederic – Ludwig?, then, the way things simply stand as a result of the systematic falsification of the sources, every attempt at clarifying in detail the religious power relations must fail. In the sphere of the falsified tradition, who ever wants to rely on an *individual* event, on a *particular* fact, will perish miserably between the millstones of the deliberate contradiction. This fact will be quite clear to the reader of my previous works as well. It is possible by a critical procedure however, to make visible again, through the source fog, the *great* mountain ranges of real history of the 14th century that interests us here. We are to further consider, that the clerical-political balance of force of those decades – e.g. as with the double election of Ludwig the Bavarian and Frederic of Austria – has not perhaps necessarily followed a once and for all fixed procedure (here: free Christians, there: church Christians!). There much rather existed the possibility of a

whole range of changing party constellations. In order to give the reader from the start a better understanding of the beginning party struggles, it is useful to already list at this point the individual groups, and to characterise their main views and fighting slogans. I want to explicitly advise that these groups have not been thought up by myself a priori, but have been developed by critical assessment of the source material.

The religious-political main fighting parties of the 14th century

1. The *God-believers*: (Pagans of a racially characteristic living-natural God belief). They rejected any so-called revelation religion fixed in writing, according to which the deity, at some time, through some person, had announced its will. The opponents of the God-believers were the free Christians as well as the clerically organised Christian communities. With no other religious group have the fathers of the falsification action so thoroughly blurred any trace of the existence and work as with these genuine medieval Pagans; they have gone under in the artificial collective term of Heretics as such.

2. The *free Christians*: "Heretics" and representatives of the idea of the invisible spirit-church. No formulated "belief" (dogma), no hierarchy, no church houses as a place of devotion. Main stone of contention: the necessity and justification of both the priest, as well as the formal imperative community (authoritarian church) of the Christians. No human being is permitted, as alleged God's representative and commissioner, by forced measures, to demand open submission, or to usurp "mediating" the work of salvation.

3. The *organised church Christians*:

a – the clerical *lay world*. Here, there is no more argument over the necessity of the priest as the mediator of salvation, but over the scope of the clergy's authority, and over the worthiness of the priestly mediator. First main problem: is the clergy permitted to cross the border of its purely spiritual function, and to somehow interfere in the organism of the secular state? Is the priesthood permitted at all to be endowed with secular power (e.g. secular jurisdiction), and secular possessions (owning land, fortune)? Second main problem: the ethical worthiness of the priest. Third main problem: the ideal of poverty of the priest as Christ's representative on Earth.

b) the *clergy*. Of the greatest significance for an understanding of the history of the 14th (and the 15th) century are the effects of tensions and opposites amongst the members of the clergy itself. Of the main problems in question here, the following may be listed. First problem: the complex of all questions regarding the priest as such, like ethical worthiness, personal poverty, marriage abstinence etc. Second problem: the hierarchical constitution of the clergy. (Is a chief, a "pope", even necessary at all? Or should the office of bishop represent the hierarchical pinnacle in the sense, that every bishop is an independent "pope" for his partial church?) Third problem: if a universal popedom is deemed necessary, which rights should be transferred to the owner of this highest office? Fourth problem: who shall be the highest authority for all dogmatic and legislative questions? (The universal pope? A general congregation of all bishops or the entire priesthood, i.e. a council? Should this council be held

with or without the participation of lay people? Or should the last decision on matters of faith be reserved for a particular corporate body of theological scholars – the doctors of Paris University?) Fifth problem: is a generally obliging universal dogma – and thus, a universal church – even necessary? In dogmatic, liturgical and such things, for how far are particular peculiarities and freedoms permitted? Should the creation of more or less separate national churches determine the form of the organised christian world?)

So, these are the religious-political main problems, which aroused the spirits of the 14th century most deeply, and separated mankind into different hostile camps.

Quite without care about our better knowledge, let us for a moment assume, that the medieval tradition is as authentic as the relativistic researchers remarkably still think it to be, then, the battle positioning of the God-believers and free Christians against the "churches" offers nothing strange. All the more conspicuous things however, are facing us in the mental state of mind of the *church Christians*, that is, in the realm of the clergy as well as in the clerical lay world. If the "history" of the late Middle Ages is authentic, then, yet again, a religious-psychological mystery emerges, for which no solution exists. Now, how do things stand with this religious-psychological fracture and rejection point in the material of the written tradition? Source-wise, it is proven to us there: with the beginning of the 14th century, popedom, as head of the "Roman universal church", has supposedly stood on the highest conceivable level of fame and power. It is sufficient to speak out the name of the alleged universal pope Bonifazius VIII. But, one will counter, especially this pope, why, at the end of his fight with the French King Philipp the Handsome, he has been disgracefully humiliated, and even been imprisoned. For the time being, let us calmly continue assuming, that the tradition reports truth here: but what did the humiliation of a temporary owner of the highest clerical honour have to do with the institution of popedom as such, and its power warrants? Not at the man, but at the *office* we have to look, not at the current pope, but at popedom as an institution. There is "genuine" history, "proving" to us, that at the beginning of that century, this "universal popedom", as the crowning of a firmly established hierarchy, had gained the greatest conceivable abundance of power. And this universal-papal abundance of power had supposedly been generally accepted and taken for granted, for being based on the holiest and most brazen principles of faith of the christian religion. That the universal popedom be necessary according to Christ's directive, on that, the sources report, no more doubt had existed among the believers of those days.

Suddenly, something monstrous happens. Out of the blue, the lightning of scepticism and revolt strikes the hallowed field of the "time-honoured" tradition of the uppermost herder's office. This is the great religious-psychological mystery: overnight, the *radical doubt* emerges *within the church itself*! And the doubt is not gnawing trifles of clerical life, but strangely, attacks the church's holiest faith doctrine. *Suddenly, popedom as such is being criticised*. Not perhaps an owner, but popedom as an institution is being subjected to criticism and scepticism! The utmost remarkable thing is, however: theologists, i.e. members of the clergy itself stepped up as popedom's doubters!

How do the historians explain to us the sudden invasion by radical scepticism, which does not even shy away from the question of the necessity of a universal popedom? Our relativists are getting flustered, because they are in vain trying, in the tradition, to find the qualifying reason for the strange revolt of theologists against the holy tradition. One could think that these theologists had been, or become, quite disbelieving spirits; but we will hear momentarily, that this guess is off target. It has to also strike, by the way, that the sceptical theologists were members of that learned association, which – as the reader remembers from the Book *Dogmatic Christianity and History Falsification* – functioned as the highest legal court in all matters faith, and as the defender of the tradition: namely Paris University! So, the historians have struggled in vain for the solution of our religious-psychological mystery. The great confusion of popedom's alleged "schism" after the year 1378 can also not have caused the scepticism, because the sharp criticism against popedom had already set in at the *beginning* of the century. That Philipp of France's political fight with the "universal pope" Bonifazius can also not have had the effect of triggering doubts on the justification of the pope with faithful theologists (!) and civil servant defenders of the tradition, has been stressed already. We thus stand before the fact: if the tradition, as we want to assume against better knowledge for a moment, were authentic, i.e. if as early as before the 14th century, a universal church with a universal popedom had existed through many centuries, then, there is simply no explanation for the around the year 1300 all of a sudden breaking out radical criticism of faithful theologists against the church's holiest of institutions, against the supreme herder's office itself.

William Occam is the name of the man, who – according to the description of the tradition – first, and at the same time, with amazing frankness and radicality in his writings, instigated the storm against the most excellent faith doctrines of the "universal church". Occam is the English thinker, also well-known in the history of philosophy, who lectured at Paris University at the beginning of the 14th century. Just how did this priest and alleged Franciscan Order man arrive at critically probing the church dogmas, that is, such dogmas, which had not been doubted for a long time? His evil philosophy – the so-called nominalism – is said to have effected, that is what one seems to think, that Occam, even in theology, has been pushed onto the path of scepticism. In reality, Occam's philosophy does not in the slightest explain his dogmatic criticism and scepticism; because after all, the actual core of the mystery lies in the question: around the year 1300, how does a faithful theologist, a teacher at the uppermost clerical judicial court of faith, get to re-designing the philosophy, this so far always so obedient servant of theology, into a dangerous entity for orthodox thinking? The theologist Occam could build up a *dangerous* philosophy only *after* his belief in important traditional doctrines of the church had already been shaken. The presented religious-psychological mystery is now still further complicated by the striking phenomenon, that Occam's spiritual storm against the church did not perhaps meet icy defence, but that his critical statements found an outrageously strong echo. We will hear more on this in the next chapter.

Allegedly, Occam found himself pushed "to defend the suspicion of bare scepticism or full-grown heresy with the excuse, that these were merely thinking exercises, after all."[1] A nowadays catholic researcher surprisedly asks, just how a real nominalist such as Occam "was able to come to terms with the dogma of the transubstantiation?" (D., p 303) Eventually, the evil nominalists, after all "wrong speculations", allegedly yet sought refuge again and again under the "protective cloak of the faith"! Odd stormers against tradition, who, next to all the criticism, humbly assure eventually: "There be nothing left to do but to submit to the command of the faith and the authority of the church". (D., p 307) Be the reader reminded here, that the tradition of Occam and the nominalists has of course also been falsified over!

For our purpose, an extended description of Occam's thoughts is quite superfluous; sufficient is the simple knowledge of the general fact, that he acted against dogmatic traditional doctrines, which up to then, according to the tradition, had stood beyond any scepticism among the faithful. With the Parisian theologist, we find the stunning "possibility" discussed theoretically, that the pope, together with the entire clergy, could turn Heretic, after which then, the right faith could still be found only "in some women and minors… This remarkable prerequisite, that the pope and the entire clergy could apostate…, shows that with Occam, there can be no talk of church power and authority in the original sense… All the much less, according to Occam, can the pope be attributed with an all-power. If not that however, then it is questionable anyhow, whether a pope is so absolutely necessary (!), or whether not different heads as representatives of different partial churches (!) could preserve the unity of the church just as well." (D., p 376/77) It strikes us particularly, that the possibility of the existence of different *partial churches* is being considered, and that at a time, when of course – if the tradition were authentic – the *universal church* stood on rock-solid foundation not only as an idea and tradition, but in "reality".

Still more important for the practice of those decades became another, at the beginning of the 14th century originating, revolutionary controversial pamphlet, which has as its authors two also to Paris working professors, namely the secular clerics *Marsilius of Padua* and the Frenchman *John of Jandun*. The title of the script alone is quite telling: *Defensor Pacis* ("Defender of the Peace"). With their book, the authors want to take on the defence of the by the demands of the "universal popes" – in truth, the French national popedom – disturbed world peace (!). "In the argument over Christ's poverty, standing quite on the side of the Minorites [of whom we will hear in the next chapter; K.], it [the *Defensor Pacis*; K.] points the church back to the by the gospel offered basis, demands that it poor, powerless, patiently pursue its only objective: to influence the morality of the human being by spiritual means. No primate [supreme herder's office; K.] of the pope, no hierarchy, no secular power or privileged position of priesthood! Only by state legislation perhaps could popedom be endowed with more than priestly powers."[2] One cannot storm more ferociously against universal popedom and hierarchy than it has happened here.

It follows from the above argumentation: if we assume, that the tradition were right, that as early as around the year 1300, a universal church with a universal popedom had existed, that is, had existed for many

centuries, firmly rooted in the tradition – then, the radical-sceptical revolt of faithful theologists, which set in out of the blue, at the beginning of the 14th century, against the faith principles of popedom and the church, is and remains an insoluble mystery. We now know however, that medieval history has been systematically falsified, and that in truth, at the beginning of the 14th century, there could not be any talk of a universal church and a universal popedom at all. So, a non-existing universal church could not have been attacked even by Occam or Marsilius. And yet, these attacks are not perhaps totally invented! They turn against a back then very real power: against the *French national church and its universal ambitions*! Not century-long accepted traditional doctrines of an alleged universal church are being doubted; the criticism does not at all aim at something originating from the past, but at *new formations* of the back then present time, at problems, which in those days, coming from France, have been thrown into Christianity *for the first time*! On these quite novel and outrageous problems and demands – independent partial churches? universal church? – Occam and Marsilius take position in their writings. After all, in reality back then, nothing except independent partial churches existed! Is it useful or dangerous to merge these partial churches into one overchurch (universal church)? This is the great question, with which the spirits of the breaking 14th century have so passionately been concerned. This was not about past, but present, better still, coming things! Not past things were criticised, but the back then for the first time emerging *plan of a henceforth to be realised universal church* with a supreme herder was, as was not to be expected any other way, most lively theoretically contemplated in an affirmative and (by Occam and Marsilius) negative sense. In the French national church, the future overchurch had just equally become a reality on a reduced scale; therefore, the attacks of a Marsilius were first and foremost aimed at the French popedom.

The end of this chapter shall be dedicated to a side problem, which the attentive reader may well have bumped into already. This problem is presented to us by the fact of the existence of such a "church-hostile" writing such as the *Defensor Pacis*. How come, that such pope-hostile writing has not been *disposed of* by the around the year 1400 beginning falsification action? Indeed, however: the script *has been* disposed of! Or much rather: it has been purposefully re-forged! What is presented to us today, is not at all the genuine, original script of Marsilius! This indubitably follows uniquely from several signs. It goes without saying, first off, the original (or the originals) of this now existing forged script, too, is missing. Then there is talk of the primate of universal popedom – but there was no universal pope in the 14th century yet. Now, the reader could think: even in this falsified version, such attack on popedom must appear conspicuous. Should the clerical forgers really have produced such a script in such aggressive form *against their own church*, that is of course, likely to their own detriment? Should the forgers have been that stupid? No, dear reader, the forgers were so clever to do this! We must have studied for long years the psychology of the forgers of the great action, we must have thoroughly studied all falsification tactics and tricks, in order to recognise the *necessity* of for example the falsification of the *Defensor Pacis*. Had written sources with pope-hostile content meant to be suppressed altogether, then, not only the *Defensor Pacis*, but all controversial literature of those decades – which will still be discussed in the next chapter – should have been radically destroyed. That would apply to

almost all appeals, declarations and letters of Ludwig the Bavarian, to name but one example. Because all these sources contain the same attacks against "universal popedom" as the *Defensor Pacis* delivers them! They are equally variations of the subject touched on by the *Defensor*. Had all this "pope-hostile" literature been suppressed, then, on the one – the Royal – side of the tradition, an empty space would have been created! That applies still more for the last quarter of the century. Had the forgers wanted to avoid any pope-hostile utterance, then, they would have had to *totally* erase the *entire* history of popedom's so-called schism. Yes, throughout all centuries of the Middle Ages, they would have had to leave standing, time and again, enormous hollow spaces in the falsified mass of the tradition, had they stupidly made it their principle to not admit anything disreputable against popedom and church at all. Again, such tactics would have been very stupid; because if on paper, the good, immaculate popedom had *been victorious all the time*, the evil kingdom had equally regularly been defeated, then, very soon all the world would have noticed, that this could *not* be *real* history.

Oh no, the fathers of the falsification action were not stupid. They knew that one cannot paint a true-to-life picture without shadow! Once before already (in *Dogmatic Christianity…*), I have pointed out the most effective of all clever falsification tactics: "Nothing strengthens the appearance of the authenticity of a falsified tradition so extraordinarily as the tactics of the forgers do – to occasionally report of themselves or their cause, respectively, *something unfavourable with full deliberation*."

2. LUDWIG THE BAVARIAN and the problem of the secularity of the clergy

In the falsified tradition, Ludwig the Bavarian stands there like another Henry IV. "History" may not have the Bavarian wander to a second Canossa in person; but instead, it has this German King so doggishly whimper and characterly humiliate himself before his papal opponents in postal messages, that even the grinning Curians to Avignon have supposedly ridiculed Ludwig: "He has gone insane from despair!"[3] Thank God, on the basis of our so far gained insights on the true nature of the so-called medieval "history", we are in a position to tear apart this shameful web of lies as well, and wash off the falsification paint from the genuine image of the nature of this proud German sovereign.

Now, just what in the handed down to us history of Ludwig the Bavarian and his time is purpose lie and prose, and what is truth? First of all, we let the falsified "history" have the word.

In the year 1322, Ludwig has defeated the forces of his Royal rival Frederic of Austria in the battle of Mühldorf, and managed to imprison him. So, by this turn, the German fight over the throne seemed finally dispatched in favour of Ludwig the Bavarian. As "history" announces, however, the "Roman universal pope", as stubbornly as before, refused to recognise Ludwig as the rightful German ruler by still withholding his papal "approbation" yet. Because the universal pope claimed the authority of granting approbation especially with regards to the Empire ('Kaiserreich'), whose most important part outside Germany was supposedly Upper Italy. So, John of Avignon pretended that there was no rightfully elected German King available, acted up as the administrator of the dispatched Empire, and appointed the friendly King Robert of Naples – the friend of the French and most violent enemy of the Germans – Imperial vicar for Italy. The young King Ludwig, however – even the falsified tradition admits to this – was not the man intimidated by anything in the world. He altogether overlooked the "universal pope" with his approbation authority, and sent himself a German Imperial vicar across the Alps in order to defend the by the pope and King Robert hard-pressed "Ghibellines". So, Ludwig dared act against John of Avignon, and that was the last straw.

By his intervention for the cause of the "Empire-loyal Ghibellines" in Italy, King Ludwig has acquired John's bitter enmity. And the "universal pope" did not hesitate letting the rebelling King-usurper feel his power. What did he do? He opened the fight, so the sources report, "by summoning, in a decree [a so-called "trial"; K.] posted on the church doors of Avignon in October 1323, the Wittelsbacher, by punishment of ban, to lay down his office within three months." The decree ordered Ludwig to immediately take responsibility before the papal judge's chair! So, a formal state prosecutor's summons coming from Avignon – if "history" were speaking truthfully here! And Ludwig the Bavarian? The German sovereign, the sources report, took the "trial" announced by the pope = state power bitterly seriously! "Ludwig attempted in vain to prove the validity of his election, also in vain, he strongly rejected the curia's presumptions. John countered the King's justified complaints in the year 1324 by stripping him of his title, and threatening with the curse of the church all who would henceforth support him." (E., p 340) In several writings ("appeals"), whose wording is handed down to us, the accused Wittelsbacher has protested his right towards the "universal pope", and rejected the opposition's claim. A critical assessment of just these appeals, however, shall now put us in a position to tear apart the web of lies, which has been thrown over the King, in one important place.

Three appeals are handed down: 1) the one from Nürnberg on 18/12/1323; 2) the one from Frankfurt on 5/1/1324; and 3) the one from Sachsenhausen on 22/5/1324. Let us assume, that the sources were offering the pure truth regarding the relations in that fight, then, it would only be natural, that the attacked King presents reasons of *public law* in the appeals, why he is the rightfully elected sovereign. But remarkably, the appeal does not limit the attacks to matters of public law, but carries them onto – *dogmatic* territory! Ludwig slings the monstrous accusation to the "universal pope's" face, that he, John, be a Heretic! What? Did the King pluck his accusation from thin air, or did he have proof for the pope's Heresy? By what would John's Heresy

make itself known? In order to understand this, we must necessarily digress a little, and throw a quick glance at certain events within the Order of the *Franciscans* (Minorites).

As "history" tells, confusion had broken out within the Order, which was related to the demand of the apostolic *poverty* posed by the Order rule. Besides a less strict faction, a trend had come up, whose proponents – called 'Fratizelles' or 'Spirituals' – saw salvation in an absolute poverty by even refusing to accept possession of everyday items (food and drink). Although, allegedly already for a long time, the "universal popes" had taken position for or against the Fratizelles, the argument within the Order failed to be settled; eventually, even the 1316 elected Order General Michael of Cesena got into conflict with the pope. It is remarkable, that besides the General, also William of Occam, whom we have already met, and several provincial heads and theological masters have supposedly signed the declaration of conflict: "It is supposedly unshakeable truth, that Christ and the Apostles never had any possessions or loans, neither individually, nor in community."[4] This sentence by John XXII now has been condemned as Heretic.

In this "historical" description of alleged Minoritian Order in-fighting, as always in the tradition of those decades, truth and lies are intensely mixed with each other. Of course, since no Roman universal church existed at the beginning of the 14th century, *no Roman-catholic Order* could exist back then, either! Why, indeed, even the alleged foundation of the Franciscan Order by Franz of Assisi is a fable, and the holy Franz himself is a purely fictional personality. This conclusion axiomatically follows from the general result of our investigation so far, and it can of course, via special examination (e.g. about the invented beginnings of the Order), be confirmed and strengthened, but there is no cause for this here. So, if the poverty fight is not about domestic, theoretical affairs of an alleged catholic Order: then, what kind of religious movement finds its purposefully falsified expression in the here sketched discord?

The historical truth is this: under the French national pope John, a religious main problem of the century became most pressing not only among France's church Christians, but also among those of Italy, Germany, England etc., that is, with many Christians, the much alienating development of the demands and authorities on the part of the French national hierarchy provided the actual trigger for this. This problem, so strongly arousing Christianity, concerned the *position of priesthood to secular* (and in particular, political) *things*, wherein the so-called poverty question played only a certain minor part. Influence of the priesthood on secular-political things, too? – that was the question stirring all spirits. *All fighting of the time of Ludwig the Bavarian radiates from this problem: and King Ludwig himself fought and died as the toughest opponent of the clergy's "secularity"*. The German King's demands of priesthood was in line with the *Defensor Pacis*, that they, poor, powerless and patient, would see their only objective in influencing people's morality by spiritual means.

With his demand, Ludwig the Bavarian stood up as the most embittered opponent of the French national pope, too; because John of Avignon (and the majority of his clergy) saw especially in the acquisition

of ever greater *secular* authorities the most effective means to secure for their national dogma the much needed external authority, and to drive forward its acceptance as universal dogma beyond France's borders. In Germany and Italy, the French effort has *partially* found a lively echo and zealous imitation within the priesthood of the individual regional churches. In Germany and Italy, too, certain priest circles sought to gain influence in the secular-political sphere: Ludwig saw it as his task to stand against the interest of the gospel that was to be spiritually proclaimed.

It is not at all surprising now, that this movement against the "secularity" of the clergy *also* broke out in the French national church. Here, in the very place of priesthood's strongest invasion of the authorities of the world and the state, especially the eyes of many laymen and some members of the clergy as well were opened, quite naturally, over the results of such encroachments of the church, which could barely, or not at all, be reconciled with Christ's soul religion. Particularly to foreign observers in the central location of the French national church – Paris University – the discrepancy between the for secular power striving priest and the detached from the world, poor Christ, had to become palpable. The main church assaulter of those days, William of Occam, the master of Paris University, was an Englishman! And the other great opponent of French popedom, the equally to Paris teaching Marsilius, hailed from Italy, from Padua! The revolt of these men proves, that regarding the appearance of the aspired future universal church, and the authorities bestowed upon the clerics, there was by no means full unanimity at all times. Here, we can already report in anticipation, that Marsilius and Occam and other "rebels" were soon forced to seek safety in the flight from France. Another thing to be pointed out yet: in the countries outside of France, the upcoming reaction against the presumed rights of the priesthood took on very severe forms. Thus, very soon in Italy and Germany, even faithful church Christians have aired their objections against the institution "church" as authoritarian formal salvation establishment, and Occam and Marsilius are simply the mouthpiece of these revolting clerical circles. At any rate, a strong backlash to *free* Christianity (without visible imperative church and authoritarian priesthood) – amongst the church Christians, too – was the characteristic attribute of the kindling fights in Germany and Italy.

We now return to *Ludwig the Bavarians's appeals*, and remember, that the King reprimanded John of Avignon for being a Heretic in one of these anti-papal declarations. In the appeal, the King also explains, why he thinks himself justified in doing so: because pope John had condemned the gospel line of Christ's absolute poverty, for which the Minorites stood. Ludwig has certainly, in broad public, declared John of Avignon as well as his successor Heretics, because his whole life's struggle was of course pointed against the Heresy of the "secularity" of the French popedom as an apostasy of the gospel. But as we have just seen, the German King could *not* have been pushed to his dogmatic attacks by Roman-catholic Minorites, because back then, Orders of the "universal church" did not exist. (Therefore, Occam has not been a Franciscan Order man, either.) Thus, the handed down appeals must, for axiomatic reasons alone, be falsified, or better, completely made up! Let us see, whether this fictionalisation of the Royal appeals can be proven in particular.

Astonishing is already the manner, by which the Royal memorandums have supposedly been created. Quite like a small private person, to whose house the prosecutor has sent a plaint, and who now rushes to the solicitor filled with fear, this is how the German King behaves. The "almighty universal pope" has clapped – oh, vey! – a writ on his back. Now is the time to "defend" oneself. So, the King has notaries and witnesses called together, in order to set up a counter-writ (just this 'appeal'). And at the end, the notaries request of the King, that he confirms his "conviction of the content's truth… by a corporal oath sworn on the gospel"! Now, the Royal accused has yet rejected this request, however. So, the notaries were not to write anything of a Royal oath? Yes, strangely, they were, so we hear, but that should be done in a more subtle manner. Namely, how? Ludwig shows himself prepared "to strengthen the truth by referring to his sworn oath to the Empire, which the German King gave at his coronation."[5] The unbiased reader will think, that there is no significant difference regarding the oath; and Zeumer, whom we follow here, concedes this as well: "In reality, in one case as much as in the other, the King gives his oath for the truthfulness of his claims." We do not intend to be kept by such tricky distinction here, however, but instead, we get to the main point. We would like to be told, what wicked game had allegedly been played here with the good-natured, but henceforth apparently plenty "stupid" King Ludwig. As one source gives away, something wicked occurred in the dark of the notarial stage. "Out of malevolent deliberation and anger against Ludwig", the first Royal notary, Ulrich the Wild, had himself mislead to a bad deed by the "Minorites". The vengeful notary, instead of sending the only by the King approved official version B of the *Sachsenhausen appeal* – which contained only Ludwig's reference to his earlier King's oath - sent out into the world a by the King dismissed first version A – with the detail of the corporal oath!! The approved version B has been locked up in the cabinet by the evil notary Ulrich, however!

The reader is now asked to keep their calm, because they will have to hear strange things. Should they perhaps nurture the idea, that Ludwig and his councillors must have very soon smelled the rat of the switch of the appeal's two versions, then, I must unfortunately inform them, on the basis of the "sources": the stupid King and his stupid councillors have not noticed anything, throughout long years (!) have they not noticed anything of the obvious fraud! Only many years later, when the notary Ulrich himself repentantly concedes his misdeed on his deathbed, only then is the wickedness brought to light, only then does the King see in terror, how clumsily he had once been betrayed! Credible sources report so, then, the affair must well and truly have been so – thus, the slave-to-tradition historians protest. With these medieval sources, however, my readers have of course long known this, the case is this: they have been systematically falsified. And behold, a first indication of forgery: the "contemporary", who handed down the admission of guilt, had the evil notary Ulrich the Wild "fatally" confused with the innocent chancellor Ulrich of Augsburg.

Ulrich the Wild's evil deed, and especially the "fact" of his switch operation remaining undetected, wants to be further contemplated. Again, everywhere in the Empire, the dismissed version A was published – and the King and his councillors suspected nothing! Surely, the notary has carried out his plan with the greatest conceivable care and cunning, the reader reckons, and again, they have the fundamentally wrong idea

of medieval "cleverness"; because Ulrich sent out the not approved version A without an accurate date and without names of witnesses! Very stupid – oh no, very smart of the man, Zeumer explains. "Surely, Ulrich could not dare furnish the by him foisted version with the names of the witnesses and notaries, who had been present or involved at the publication of the B version to Sachsenhausen, and who would likely have had knowledge of the King's oath refusal and his behaviour otherwise. Ulrich seems to much rather have contented himself with adding to the specimen of the A text sent out into the world by him the date of a year in the shortest possible form. Scripts A4 and A5 contain such a date in the form: anno domini 1324." And behold, dear reader, because Ulrich had – proceeded so exceedingly stupidly, nobody has discovered the fraud! Now, if however, one is, unlike the relativistic history researchers, not a blind slave to the tradition, then, one realises with this alleged remaining undetected already, that with the described wickedness, and thus, with the appeals themselves, something is not right. There is no doubt at all: this "clever" Ulrich, with his in truth so obvious fraudulent manoeuvre, would have been exposed in as soon as a few days. The fact alone, that this Royal proclamation, this highly important public law script, which would have been lively discussed everywhere, had been sent into the world without the necessary entries of the notaries and witnesses, and without an accurate date (without day and location!), would have startled all interested people. The witnesses, the notaries, the Royal councillors, the King himself, would have inevitably discovered the stupid swindle; because they themselves – Ludwig and his councillors – thus "history" narrates, have witnessed a publication of the foisted A text! (NA 37, p 244, footnote 1)

We need to merely try and imagine the described events in the sphere of hard reality, in order to immediately realise, that this whole alleged switch affair is a fable. Some researchers are of the opinion, that the notary Ulrich's offence had consisted of smuggling in the entire delicate material on the dogmatic discussions into the text of the appeal, the way it had been approved by the King, and whose original wording only referred to questions of public law. In that case, however, the scandalous fraud of the notary would have only been brought to light sooner still! Now, what for example, if Ludwig the Bavarian had only afterwards invented and presented the entire alleged fraud affair, in order to afterwards, with the pope, wash his hands of his one-time dogmatic utterances? This assumption does not offer a solution to the mystery complex of these appeals, either: but the peculiarities point the reader, who is familiar with my general result, to the right trail.

The so-called *Sachsenhausen appeal*, with whose mysteries we have just been concerned, is handed down in *two versions* (recensions): an attribute of the learned history falsification action well known to us. In our case, the lack of the complete date and the witnesses in version A leads to the "sore spot". The future learned forgers were careful, as so often, not to *uniquely* identify the fatal trinity of place, date and name (witnesses), because they knew, how dangerous that was when pursuing historical falsification and fiction. If an alleged complex of "facts" must be poetically constructed, then it is key to proceed extremely gently with the fictionalised connection of date, place and person, in order to not experience a let-down afterwards. In such cases, the "double-entry book-keeping", in particular the *elastic dating*, or simpler still: leaving *gaps* for

date, place or name, are popular and endlessly often utilised camouflage measures. (In *Falsification of German History*, the reader can thoroughly inform themselves on this point.) Regarding the *Sachsenhausen appeal*, too, the forgers have, in full deliberation, either completely left out, or only partly (the year only) entered places, dates, names in the forged "versions". The elastic dating very nicely reveals itself by the fact, that in different specimen (copies) of the A version, *different* year dates are entered: once 1324, the other time 1325. (NA 37, p 244) Another codex contains the copy of the appeal "with the date 'datum a.d… [musty stain!; K.]… ind. 7, die 22 mensis… [musty stain!; K.]".[6] Oh, these considerate musty stains! The year numeral and the name of the month, of all things, they erase! The "contemporary" G Villani from Florence has also viewed a specimen of the appeal; and what month's name has he read? October! (In truth, the *Sachsenhausen appeal* has supposedly been proclaimed on 22 May 1324) The naming of the place – how careful! – can even be found in only one copy of the B version. Furthermore, the following is quite telling: "It must strike, that not one single specimen authorised by seal is handed down to us." (NA 37, p 244, footnote 2) This leaning of the else so blind chance, to pick for destruction especially the medieval *originals* has already previously caused my readers much astonishment.

We have established: the *Sachsenhausen appeal* is a forgery through and through, i.e. from start to end fiction. Never has Ludwig the Bavarian, after the alleged summons of the "universal-papal" state prosecutor, filled with fear, released an affidavit counter-declaration before notaries and witnesses. Because a universal pope did not exist yet. And naturally, the French national pope (much like his successors) has equally never been able to reference any "official" rights with regards to the German Kingdom, because the domestic German affairs were as much the Frenchman John's business, as they were that of the man in the moon. From this knowledge, it follows axiomatically, that not only the Sachsenhausen, but *all* appeals are learned products of the poeticising history falsification action. It is connected with this, that the whole nature of the tense relations between John of Avignon (his successors, respectively) and King Ludwig, the way the falsified tradition is labouring to present it, has been purposefully re-interpreted. Ludwig has not "defended" himself; but pope John, on the other hand, has also never "officially" prosecuted. So, the papal "trials" are pure deception then. But what now? So, between John and Ludwig, there were in reality no tense relations at all? Oh, yes. And we have of course already clarified above, that, and why, the two were facing each other as enemies: not as "universal pope" and "Roman" King (and Emperor), but *there* as leader of the politicising French national church, and *here* as Royal leader of the opponents of the French universal ambitions and the secular power of the priesthood as such. The two opponents have really clashed very violently, albeit not for the reasons and in the forms the way "history" wants to see them.

3. First attempt of the creation of a German-Italian counter-popedom

Much like at Henry VII.'s time, so under Ludwig the Bavarian, too, Italy moves into the focus of struggles of great world-political significance. And again, the *French national church* emerged as the instigator. All struggles of those decades are open or veiled *religious struggles*, behind which the French national church stands as originator, struggling for the dissemination of their dogma. From the Book *Dogmatic Christianity…*, we know, why the French church was unable to help their dogma on to the (initially, national) autocracy by spiritual means alone, but that it succeeded in gaining for their purpose the French Kingdom as wilful helper and "secular arm". Regarding Italy now, around that time, the influence of the French national pope, thanks to King Robert of Naples' alliance, had already grown dominant in Middle Italy. A next objective was enticing: to soften up Upper Italy (Lombardy) for dogmatic conquest by preceding political submission. In Upper Italy, too, pope John was already able to rely on a certain following in this – the so-called *Guelphs*; the resistance of the opposition however – the Ghibellines, especially in Lombardy, turned out to be exceedingly tenacious. Florence could be considered the power centre of the Guelphs, Milan the main headquarters of the Ghibellines. One thing, one must not overlook however: the constant wavering and changing of party standpoints of parts of both followings. (It goes without saying, in this regard, the falsified sources must not be literally believed; the handed down party grouping, for a certain point in time, for a certain place, is often flat out invented.) It lay simply in the nature of the religious fermentation, that since the advent of the clerical priesthoods in the regional churches, and with the increase of their not only spiritual, but also their secular authorities, all relations in the flow of events had to become unstable. The by France aspired development in the direction of an autocracy of *their* dogma (and, as a pre-condition for this, an increase of the influence of the hierarchy in the political-secular sphere) did by no means proceed smoothly and undisturbed. Set-backs did not fail to appear. And under Ludwig the Bavarian, of all people, even in France itself – as we have already heard – in the lap of the Parisian dogma headquarters, the great turn-back set in. *Limitation of the priestly authorities to the office of spiritual teacher and admonisher* – that was the slogan of the opposition against pope John and any hierarchy of a regional church as such, wherein in Germany and Italy, the pendulum of religious interest strikingly strongly turned to the side of the "free" Christians. However, destiny chose the German King Ludwig the Bavarian as the political leader of this religious opposition movement.

Above, we have had "history" tell us, that Ludwig's intervention on behalf of the "Empire-loyal Ghibellines" had supposedly brought on the severe break of relations with "universal pope" John. That a historically genuine core lay hidden in this description, we have acknowledged. If "history" continues reporting however, that the "universal pope" had spoken out the excommunication over the unruly German sovereign, and the papal interdict over Ludwig's followers, then, history is blatantly lying here. This time, the deception becomes effortlessly intelligible from the falsified tradition: because the sources point out the astonishing fact, that in Germany, the reigning Princes did not care *at all* about any interdict or anathematic rays of the "universal pope", and that not perhaps just the actual "Minoritian Order opposition", but

noteworthily, also a very large proportion of the clergy, did not at all observe the"trials" and the interdict launched by "their" pope. The alleged universal pope found precious little obedience with "his" clergy in Germany! In truth, such strikes by the French national pope, who had nothing to command in Germany, had to end in smoke, or, more accurately: John of Avignon did not dream of "officially" intervening against the German King.

So, it was on Italy's soil, where the differences between John and Ludwig were meant to be settled by the sword. Already, a French-papal legate stood in Lombardy with a recruited army. The Bavarian now also crossed the Alps, and temporarily made camp in Trient. By and by, the entire "clerical opposition" gathered around him: William of Occam, Marsilius of Padua, the alleged Order General Michael of Cesena, and others.

What interests us is, how "history" describes the coming Italian events. According to that, the German King feels more prompted than chosen to intervene in Italy. In an "authentic" letter, he airs himself thus: "Although we came to Trient… for several particular reasons, namely because of those loyal to the Empire [the "Ghibellines"; K.] and our crown, all the noble folk from the towns, patches and castles [in Upper Italy; K.], who were loyal to the Imperial crown, received us, and explained to us their uncountable oppressions and troubles, to which they, the followers of the Empire, could no longer stand up. Under tears and sobbing, they begged of us, they offered to us their personages, and the power of 19 bishoprics and downright uncountable localities and castles next to a lot of money, they conjured us…, to proceed to action for the termination of their unbearable burdens, and according to old custom, accept the Imperial diadem and the throne of the Empire."[l] (E., p 342) In brief: the poor, oppressed "Empire-loyals" (Ghibellines) begged Ludwig for help against the oppression by the Guelphs allied with the "universal pope". Just let us have a closer look at this alleged party constellation in Italy.

Right at the start, there is the wonderful loyalty of the Ghibellines towards Ludwig and the Empire that inspires an enormous respect in us. Especially, since we know, that the German reigning Princes and bishops, back then, bare of all "Imperial" ideals, did not give one hoot about the "holy Roman Empire". (Simply for the reason, that a Roman Empire did not yet exist back then!) However, the loyalty of the Ghibellines appears literally frightening, the longer we put ourselves in their boots. Do they not say it themselves, how terribly they are persecuted by the Guelphs because of their attachment to the Empire? But for the sake of the proud idea of the "Roman Empire", they willingly take all pains upon them. That is: from now on, only conditionally! Because we also learn from the Royal letter, that if Ludwig were *not* to come to Italy, "then, they would henceforth terminate their loyalty to us". Strange: so far, these "loyals" have defended the "Empire" against all Guelphish-papal opponents willingly and under the greatest sacrifices. Where from, and why, such wonderful loyalty and alleged attachment to the Empire? They do not gain any advantages for their loyalty to the Empire, on the contrary, nothing but troubles and oppressions! What actually do our historians

[l] Ugh – if it isn't that old 'style' again…

say to this phenomenon? They themselves are of the opinion, that in truth, the Ghibellines' loyalty to the Empire was rather lukewarm; that the latter had only feigned to be so Empire-loyal, in order to put Ludwig to service for their very private and local dealings. And again, the good-natured, stupid King falls for the feigned protestations! But how? After all, according to "history", the Ghibellines were indeed involved in a tough fight against the pope-attached Guelphs *because of their loyalty to the Empire* (!). And just this opposition of the two parties, the way it is being purposefully motivated by the tradition, poses a psychological problem. The "Guelphs" were visibly quite content with the rule of the "universal pope"! Then, why do other Italians (just these Ghibellines) so vigorously fight against the comfort of the "universal-papal" supreme Highness? After all, both parties also had – always under the against better knowledge assumed authenticity of the medieval tradition – the same "catholic universal religion". After all, according to "history's" statement, the Ghibellines were decried by the enraged "universal pope", because they dared stand up *politically* against the pope, and because they sided with the excommunicated King Ludwig. So, if the Ghibellines were allegedly loyal sons of the "universal church", then, why this silly resistance against Mr Pope? Yes, why? When the same "Empire-loyals" a little later, after Ludwig's withdrawal from Italy, "indeed" exceedingly swiftly made up with the "universal pope"?! Yes, why, when these Ghibellines, only a few years earlier, have supposedly requested of the pope (!) the brother of the French King for a protector?! The relativistic researchers have also contemplated this problem, and they reckon, that they have found a satisfactory explanation: Italian national freedom ideas were supposedly inspiring the Ghibellines. Consider this: these remarkable freedom heroes want to become independent by suppliantly ask a foreigner, namely the German King, for the supreme rule over their lands! In that case, they might as well have put up – nay, fared better – with the temporary supreme rule of the "universal pope". Much like the German King, Mr Pope was also far away! In the latter case, the "cruel oppression" by the Guelphs would also have found a swift end.

Back then, the rulers' house of *Visconti* of Milan provided the heads of the Ghibelline party. Matteo Visconti, the most dangerous opponent of the French curia, had died in the year 1322. Just how burning his enmity against Avignon was, is attested by the information of witness statements: "Matteo has supposedly worked in preparation for the Germans (!) and the Ghibellines and the Italian rebels (!) to elect a new pope (!)." Note well: *the Germans and Italians are meant to elect an extra pope*, as a rival to the French one. Another time, Matteo is alleged to have uttered (as early as several years before Ludwig the Bavarian's break with the "universal pope"), "that namely John XXII. be as much a rightful pope as Matteo himself".[7] Here, it becomes visible right through the falsified sources, that the Ghibellines' defence was not only aimed against the "universal pope's" longings for secular rule, but that it was pointed at the French popedom as such. After Matteo's death, his sons (especially the oldest: Galeazzo) have successfully continued the fight against the Guelphs and pope John.

Now, by following the further events of Ludwig the Bavarian's Italy journey, we are partly lead into the realm of pure fiction by "history". In reality, Ludwig's expedition was no comfortable "Italy journey",

during which one "met no resistance anywhere", but this journey was a campaign against the Guelphish-papal opponent in Italy. First off, the so-called Italy journey was no coronation travel to Rome! The King was unable to travel to Rome for a simple reason (and thus, also unable to have himself crowned Emperor): because a *town* Rome did not exist at all back then. At the time of Ludwig the Bavarian, Rome was a void inhabited by cattle herders. Only since the beginning of the 15th century, Rome has gradually developed to a town, to the modern world city of the real universal popes. (Regarding this, my readers will remember the conduct of evidence in *Mystery Rome*...) So, since Ludwig's alleged Rome campaign is a fable, the historians will no longer have to wonder over the conspicuous "fact", that neither the in Italy stationed legate with his superior (!) fighting force, nor Charles of Calabria with his army, was blocking the path of the Royal Rome traveller, but that both Ludwig's opponents, like paralysed from fear, were equally forming an espalier in the Rome campaign. In the fictionalised "history", however, it goes without saying, that one does not have the German King be attacked by his opponents, because else, the King would *not* arrive *at* Rome!

While Ludwig's coronation to Emperor is flat out invented (it has not perhaps taken place in a location other than Rome, either, since back then, a "Roman universal *Emperordom*" existed as much as a Roman universal *popedom*), one of the most significant events of the 14th century may also be handed down covered with a disfiguring falsification layer, but here, we are able to comparatively easily expose the genuine core. This in the developmental history of the Christian regional churches so important event is the first attempt of the *creation of a German-Italian extra-popedom*. What Matteo Visconti had wished for as early as a decade earlier, now found its realisation by Ludwig the Bavarian: the Germans and Italians, for the first time, nominated for *their* regional churches an independent own pope.

According to the sources, how and where was the event of electing the Italian-German pope supposedly proceeding? "History" announces: in a public meeting[II] chaired by the allegedly only recently crowned "Roman Emperor", a proclamation of Ludwig was read out by a German abbot. This declaration was pointed against the French priest, "who lyingly calls himself John XXII." "He is the horseman of the apocalypse…, who went out to remove peace from Earth. He further reveals himself as the destroyer of gospel truth and order by the fact, that he orders to trespass the Christian teachings of the rule and reign of temporal things by the Emperordom, and that he wants to unite within himself Emperordom and popedom against Christ's explicit commandment." (M. 1, p 185-186) In still further formulations, the proclamation takes position against the "secularity" of the alleged universal pope of Avignon, and ipso facto declares John as the supreme herder deposed by Christ himself. Then followed – always according to the falsified sources – in a second gathering on Peter's square to Rome, the elevation of the alleged Minorite *Peter of Cordoba* to the new, rightful "universal pope" by an affirmative shout of the Roman people. As we hear further, the new pope has supposedly assumed the name Nicolaus V. "The personage of the elected is sufficiently characteristic. A simple mendicant friar steps up to the top of the church, whose ideal of course (the *Defensor Pacis*' idea, too)

[II] orig. 'Volksversammlung', lit. 'gathering of the volk'

is a poor church stripped of all secular rule, stripped even of all possessions. (M. 1, p 194) However, the sources now announce details on the reign of the new pope, which are barely compatible with the ideal of a poor church: the monk pope has supposedly very soon surrounded himself with all the outward pomp of an own hierarchy. He has supposedly created a board of cardinals for himself, whose pretentious staff wished to live as worldly and splendidly as their colleagues in Avignon. According to this, there could not have been any talk of simplicity and "christian poverty" at pope Nicolaus' court, either.

We are curious, how, according to "history", Christianity in the "universal church" was supposedly receiving the proclamation of a counter-pope. There is the "contemporary" Mussatus reporting: "News of this spread across the entire circle of the Earth, and drove Christians everywhere to attach themselves to one of the fighting parties. Almost all of Christianity was split in two parts." (E., p 347) If we now want to believe other "credible" news, then, Mussatus has laid it on a little thick; because according to the statement of *this* series of sources, the world outside of Italy did not get excited in the slightest over the election of the counter-pope. *These* sources report, that barely any notice was taken of the event. "Not even the German reigning Princes", according to *this* source material, "acknowledged the pope of their Emperor".[8] Even in Ludwig's direct environment, the "level-headed" ones did supposedly not agree with the proclamation of the "counter-pope". And behold, the glorious and festive days in the "world capital city" Rome soon took a sudden ending. The at first allegedly so favourable mood of the Romans turned around; and any further stay in the Tiber town became so dangerously threatening, that one decided upon withdrawal. "Under the invectives of the people, who shouted "Heretic" and "excommunicated one" after them…, followed by… stone-throws, the Emperor, his pope and their cardinals moved out, disgraced and like in flight." (M. 1, p 206) Very swiftly everywhere now, the famed "loyalty to the Empire" of the Ghibellines started faltering. Eventually, defeats of the "Imperial" troops caused Ludwig the Bavarian's Roman campaign an infamous end, as tradition reports. When leaving Italian soil, there was almost nobody left of the Ghibelline party leaders, who have drawn the Emperor to Italy, at any rate, nobody (!) on Philipp's side." (M. 1, p 223) So, the Ghibelline heads repentantly returned into the open arms of the "universal church" and the "universal pope" of Avignon!

Just what in this history tale is historically true? First off, for repeatedly presented reasons, all events are a sack of lies inasmuch as they were supposedly occurring in the "world city" Rome. That means however, that also the election of the Italian-German extra-pope *cannot* have happened in Rome. Besides that, we must by *no* means trust this event *in all* handed down *details*. *Only this* can be historically established: the *bare fact* of the proclamation of the German-Italian own popedom as such! What must remain uncertain, is the detail of the location as well as the detail of the date. *Pisa*, where Ludwig, on the return to home, has supposedly stayed from September 1328 until April 1329, *could* well have been the place of Nicolaus' elevation to pope. Because "history" is blabbing out a secret once: on his deathbed, Michael Cesena (the alleged Franciscan Order General) has supposedly made the confession, that he, "as cardinal bishop of Ostia", had crowned the

counter-pope Nicolaus in Pisa".[III] (M. 1, p 370) It is furthermore remarkable, that in Pisa, a *repeated* deposition proclamation has supposedly been decreed against John of Avignon. The information on pope Nicolaus' further fate is also falsified. After King Ludwig's return home, thus it is handed down to us, he [Nicolaus] stayed back in Italy, and had to experience that all his followers abandoned him again in a short period of time. Eventually, the deceived and abandoned had no other choice but to surrender himself to the discretion of his rival in Avignon, who kept him prisoner to the end of his life. Thus far "history", which, yet again, is lying as fast as horse can trot here. It is correct, however, that this first Italian-German popedom was of only short duration, and was unable to gain any real significance for the life and the organisation of the existing regional churches (perhaps regarding a *union* of the German-Italian partial churches). However, the cause of the failure of this extra-popedom is plain to see: it lies in the lack of the "dogmatic exhibition document". (In the book *Dogmatic Christianity*..., one can read up on the unconditional necessity of the so-called dogmatic basis of a hierarchy.) In the French national church, this basis had been established, and "solidified" with the support of the secular arm. But in Germany as well as in Italy, a *uniform* dogma was still *lacking*, and a pan-folkish Italian-German overall dogma was nowhere on the horizon yet. Therefore, the supreme herderdom of poverty pope Nicolaus had been built in a dogmatic vacuum, and had to inevitably collapse again. Especially through the *ideal* of this anti-French extra popedom, that outcome had been still accelerated, because this ideal strove for a possibly *purely spiritually* upper leadership, to be realised in a christian world possibly *free from formal-clerical (authoritarian) ties*. However, government without authority is a contradiction in terms.

Triumphantly, "history" announces "Nicolaus' submission" under the allegedly victorious "universal pope" John of Avignon. And with still greater satisfaction now, the falsified tradition reports of God's judgement over the "church-hostile" King Ludwig, whose willpower and Royal dignity dwindled under the terrible anathema of the divine representative in Avignon. The King may not have wandered to Avignon-Canossa in person, but he has supposedly all the more begged in ever renewed submission offers for the forgiving mercy of the "universal pope". Although we axiomatically know, that "history" is lying here, we would like to assess a little more thoroughly the tradition on the alleged tense relations between King Ludwig and pope John (and his successors, respectively). There, it has to strike already, that Ludwig has *at no time* been *forced* by irreconcilable political difficulties – perhaps by abandonment of the Imperial Princes – to his disgraceful penitent part. On the contrary: when the lamenting behaviour and the deplorable begging for mercy of their King became too much for the Electors, and they feared that Ludwig would not flinch from a curtailment of Imperial rights, only to seek redemption from the papal ban, they congregated to *Rense*, in order to establish against the claims of the "universal pope" before all the world: someone rightfully elected Roman King by the Electors requires no "approbation" by the "apostolic chair" in Avignon. Now, this Electoral "statement" itself may again be a lie – because a German King was simply no "Roman" King, and

[III] A deathbed confession on something that should have been public knowledge? Is it just me?

had officially absolutely nothing to do with the French national pope – but it reveals, that the Wittelsbacher did not need to write begging letters to Avignon under domestic political pressure. As is being reported to us, however, there was no advising and helping him, who was shaking from pangs of conscience because of the ban, so that the "penitent" sacrificed "even the greatest advantages [such as the valuable alliance with England; K.] naively as a child (!), only in order to calm the voice of his quailing heart, and to purchase the peace with the church"[IV].[9]

Pangs of conscience and contrition of the heart have supposedly worn down the proud Wittelsbacher, because the anathema from Avignon was allegedly weighing down his soul. The poor King has supposedly time and again humbly begged for the termination of the church ban with three Avignonian popes, and accepted submission conditions, which, if there were a true word in these negotiations, would have labelled the German King a character weakling of the highest order. Ludwig allegedly sent legations over legations to Avignon, because apparently, "his soul was longing for the mercy of his holiness, the way a newborn is longing for the mother's breast".[V] (W. 1, p 341) And again and again, the Royal messengers were arrogantly fobbed off by all the holy fathers. Sometimes allegedly, one was almost prepared to take the begging one forgivingly back into their arms, but then unfortunately, the King of France or Naples or Bohemia sabotaged the reconciliation, or Ludwig was not sufficiently "repentant". Eventually, as already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, it has supposedly gotten as far as the court folks at the curia scoffing: Ludwig has gone insane from despair.

Preserved for us is the wording of so-called *procuratoria*; these are writs, in which the *curia* to Avignon dictated to King Ludwig the *conditions for reconciliation* (!), which the latter was then meant to acknowledge and accept by seal, as well as to conscientiously carry out the accepted conditions. And truly, "history" narrates, the German sovereign has "indeed" accepted the curia's dictates multiple times: he has confirmed by seal, that he, for example, would lay down the title Emperor, that he would promise the pope obedience (!), that he would eradicate the Heretics (especially his learned confederate allies) marked by the pope, if they did not want to return to the "universal church". Ludwig's legations have supposedly solemnly declared to pope Clemens, "that their master, for the atonement of his crimes and the delivery of the relevant satisfaction, would surrender himself to the holy father's discretion with body and soul, with goods and chattels, with freedom and his will. This assurance was followed by the oath of the legation, by which they obliged their master to conscientiously obey the pope's orders." (W. 1, p 347)

Once again: we know that the here described prosecution relations, from the first papal "trial" to Ludwig the Bavarian's last alleged declaration of submission, is a pack of lies. Now however, we notice the black mark of the literary construction on the falsified source tradition itself. Namely, we again stand before a

[IV] It is bits like these that make this translation actual joy; I have not laughed as much since the last incident of 'the style'. It makes a pattern large as life, once you start reading "history".

[V] Oh, those Germans, whiny little babies, right? How come that *anybody* believes this horse dung?

psychological fracture and rejection point; and the psychological mystery appears in connection with the procuratoria. What was the story with these again? The pope dictated the conditions, which the King had to accept, and whose execution he had to confirm by oath, if a reconciliation were to be effected. "Indeed" now of course, the King did accept the conditions, and also swore to most conscientiously carry out the obligations taken on; so, with this, the argument was settled, the reconciliation a reality! To him/her, who thinks reasonably like this, "history" has, to their considerable surprise, the following answer: off target! *That Ludwig accepted the conditions, was only the prerequisite for any negotiating over the conditions (of the reconciliation) at the papal court at all*!! Really, dear reader, if we want to believe "history", then, despite the sealed procuratoria (i.e. despite the acceptance of the posed conditions, it has every time resulted in negotiations (of the curia with the Royal legations) over just those submission conditions. Ludwig has a priori given his legations, besides the sealed procuratoria, further special "*instructions*" on the way, which were meant to serve as the actual basis for the final settlement of the conditions! The relativistic researchers, too, have racked their brains over this psychological peculiarity – *acceptance* of the conditions, and yet, subsequent *negotiations* over the conditions. Because the procuratoria have not perhaps been withheld by the legate, but, as is explicitly stressed, have been handed to the pope at the start of negotiations! (M. II, p 321 and 324) An explanation of the mystery on the part of the historians is now this: the curia had tolerated and was expecting, that the conditions, set by the curia and *accepted* (!) by the King, were in reality not binding, but only represented the temporary "basis" for the actual conditions to be determined. Ludwig, on his part, one continues "explaining", *clairvoyantly assumed* such interpretation (his acceptance of the conditions by sealing the procuratoria) by the pope; so, he thought nothing of it, to completely accept the conditions in the procuratoria, since he "sensed", that despite all this, there would be negotiations! We do not want to further contemplate this "certain hunch" of Ludwig, and how the curia would assess his acceptance of the conditions, because it is clear, that the above explanation owes its birth to a conclusion from circular reasoning. Just because, according to the falsified tradition, the conditions *had* still *been negotiated*, despite acceptance of the conditions: from just this "fact" follows the "explanation", that indeed now, everybody involved would have a priori *assumed* such subsequent negotiations! This explanation does not solve the mystery of the "divining" participants, but merely sketches the "fact", the way the history falsifiers have constructed it. The real explanation, which must not relativistically circulate within the framework of the papal tradition, seeks its basis in the living experience. Its principle question will always have to be: is the described behaviour psychologically *possible*? Only if we *had to* assume a quite *peculiar* psychology with the King (and his council) as well as with the Avignonian popes, we could accept the possibility of the reported. However, there is nothing forcing us to such assumption, not even paper tradition itself. So, of course, our axiomatic knowledge does not leave us doubting the impossibility of the described peculiar psychic life. Referencing *experience* teaches us, that a psychic behaviour, the way it is described, is *most improbable* with the persons in question, since it is not to be assumed, that the disposition of all of these people should have been mentally abnormal. This probability is then, via axiomatic conclusion from our previous general results, increased to

full *certainty*. Ludwig the Bavarian's alleged submission negotiations have been invented front to end by the fathers of the history falsification action.

4. The counterstrike of the French national popedom

Ludwig the Bavarian, as leader of a powerful "anti-secular" countermovement, saw his life's mission in putting a stop to the universal-dogmatic ambitions of the French national church in Germany and Italy. Indeed, this counteraction was able to keep away Gallicanism from Germany for several decades, and to considerably push it back in Italy. A permanent success failed to materialise, however. The "ideal" Italian-German extra-popedom even collapsed surprisingly swiftly; and this fiasco had to leave an unfavourable impression on even some of Ludwig's followers. It is therefore not surprising, that even during Ludwig the Bavarian's lifetime, France's national church could regain some lost territory of influence in many places. Afresh, the French popedom played the part of the victorious attacker, and its first tough blows were aimed at the most bitter enemy, the German King. This turn of things must now be treated.

The curia in Avignon had realised, that the counteraction's impetus could most effectively be neutralised in its centre of political power – within the German Kingdom. If the French popedom succeeded in gaining German Electors for the nomination of a suitable *counter-King*, then, one could hope for the best for a renewed advance of Gallicanism in Germany and Italy. Again, the prospect of realising the plan was primarily depending on the existence of a suitable candidate for the throne on behalf of the French national church. And such a candidate was already on stand-by! It goes without saying, one is prone to say, the applicant for the German crown was a member of the Luxemburgian House of rulers, the well-known dynasty, in which the friendliness to the French was notorious. Margrave Charles of Moravia was the name of Ludwig the Bavarian's opponent, who now entered the political arena. He was the son of King John of Bohemia, thus a grandchild of the former "Roman Emperor" Henry VII.

The upbringing of the young Bohemian Prince was from the start carried out quite in the ban of the French national church's world of ideas. The future German King Charles (the alleged "Roman Emperor" Charles IV.) was even able to pride himself for having had as a friend and teacher a man, who later became French national pope – Peter Roger, the future pope Clemens VI.! Namely, King John of Bohemia had sent his son, in the seventh year of his life, to Paris, in order to have him educated there. Directly after his arrival, the seven year-old Charles was married to a French Princess. There is no need to stress, how profound and lasting the experiences of the stay in Paris, in secular-political as well as in particularly clerical-religious

regard, must have been for the impressionable young mind of the Bohemian Prince. Here in Paris, in the midst of the theological masters of the university, the knave's heart and spirit must have been practically flooded with the ideas of the French national church. A high-ranking cleric, the already mentioned Peter Roger, was happily prepared to thoroughly familiarise the young Prince with the views and dogmas of France's church. Naturally, about the "ideal-christian" theories and those about public law by some Occam, some Marsilius and the German King Ludwig, the pupil will have only learned, that they are unconditionally wrong and reprehensible. There is the telling news, that Charles had supposedly also received the minor orders, i.e. he had become "half" a priest (of the French national church).

The Bohemian Prince was also able to early familiarise himself with *Italy's* political and clerical state of affairs right there and in person. The opportunity for this he gained via the "Italian adventure" of his father, the King of Bohemia. Namely, Ludwig the Bavarian had barely returned to Germany from his "Rome journey" when, as "history" announces, legates of the "Guelphs" from Brescia offered to John of Bohemia, who was staying in Trient at the time, the signory (rule) over their town. Why? In order to defend their town against the Ghibelline tyrant from Verona with John's help. If John was to follow the call, he would thus interfere with "Imperial" as well as "universal-clerical" rights. Despite all of this, John accepted the offer of the legate; and the question emerges: did the Bohemian King come on secret orders of Ludwig or the French popedom? A "contemporary" chronicler now announces, that John had supposedly gone to Italy with Ludwig's consent.[10] However, from other sources, we learn, that the Bohemian had supposedly *not* interfered in the Italian state of affairs on Ludwig's orders or with Ludwig's knowledge. (A., p 261) So, the French popedom stood behind John as the secret customer? "Now, just this, namely that the King had appeared in Italy tolerated by the *pope*, nay, even on his orders, has been claimed by himself (!) right from the start." (A., p 280) And what did the "universal pope" say to this? He may have (publicly) denied having "ordered" the Bohemian to the enterprise, but tellingly, he did *not* declare in several writs, "that he would act against it [John's enterprise; K.], why, not even explicitly, that he would disapprove of it." (A., p 284) And behold, during the course of the action, it turned out, that John had a face to face consultation with the papal legate in Italy, whose result was the proclamation of the "heart-felt understanding", i.e. an alliance! (A., p 321) It is simply wonderful, how Upper Italy's towns have allegedly practically scrambled for accepting the Bohemian King as their sovereign, that is, Ghibelline communities just as zealously as Guelphish ones. Just like his father Henry VII., John appeared as peacemaker: expelled Ghibellines had to be re-admitted by the opponents on the order of the Bohemian! Yes, John even decreed a prohibition to henceforth call oneself Ghibelline or Guelph! (A., p 265) Exceedingly interesting is the end of the adventure. The mood changed yet again: *against* the Bohemian King. As "history" knows, there was even a *Guelpho-Ghibelline federation* forming, against the only recently so joyfully received King John. But the league did not only want to drive the Bohemian out of the country, but also the legate of the "universal pope". "Strange is the introduction [of the federal contract; K.], according to which, a federation that of course also turned against the pope's deputy, was yet founded to the church's and the pope's honour. To honour the pope, his deputy was meant to be fought." (A., p 412) That

means: John did not succeed in rousing a great deal of love for the French popedom in Italy; instead, certain circles of previous church opponents came together for the defence against the Avignonian influence.

As mentioned, the back then fifteen year-old Prince Charles, too, took part in his father's Italian adventure, he had to even temporarily stand in for his father. The young man was not only able to practice the art of warfare and political negotiations, but also found himself placed into the middle of the clerical-dogmatic arena. Italian practice was added to French theory.

It is now time to again remember the part, which Charles of Moravia was meant to play as the Royal rival of Ludwig the Bavarian. First off, may the sources chatter.

Then, we remember, that the Bavarian, despite his humble begging, did not succeed with three "universal popes" – John, Benedict, Clemens – to gain absolution and the approbation to "Roman King". Pope Clemens – this is Peter Roger, Charles of Moravia's educator – naturally renewed the "trial" against Ludwig, because he knew what he wanted. When the "banned" German King did not appear in Avignon to take responsibility, his solemn malediction occurred from there! And the German Electors were ordered by Clemens, thus reports "history", to immediately proceed to electing a new King, else, the "universal pope", who is of course entitled to "right and power of election", would proactively take measures. Archbishop Balduin of Trier had already previously received from Avignon the order, to find a suitable candidate for the re-election; and Balduin did not have to seek for long. So, his nephew, just this Charles of Moravia, swiftly travelled over Trier to Avignon, in order to learn from pope Clemens the conditions, on which he could become German King. Clemens did not set any harmless conditions, but they were most willingly accepted. After this, the pope sent letters to the Electors of Köln, Trier and Sachsen [Saxony], in which he made Charles' election an obligation for them! "On the set day, five Electors gathered in Rense, one of whom was the father, another the great-uncle of the candidate, the third [Mainz; K.] was an Elector without land, the others, Köln and Sachsen, have been bribed with large sums."[11] It goes without saying, the presented Charles of Moravia was elected. How mysteriously these election events must have proceeded, is hinted at by the remarkable utterance of a "contemporary": "… that it was not easy to find out, how, where, when and by whom Charles [was] elected".[12]

To expose the historical core in this purposeful description will no longer be a difficult task for the attentive reader. Everything is a pack of lies, which refers to the alleged "legal authority of the universal pope" towards the German King and the archbishops and Electors. If, according to this, the French pope was perhaps not able to rely on tradition and legal title, in order to interfere in German (and Italian) affairs, there was, now as before, nothing keeping him, however, to crucially influence the decisions of influential personalities in Germany (and Italy) through secret channels, for example by money donations. That is what happened then, too, and thoroughly. The dawning turn of the mood in Germany, too, which made itself known by the renewed growing strong of the *secular*-clerical ambitions, was working towards the desires of the French popedom.

In Avignon (and later as King), Charles has supposedly pledged oaths to the pope. Now, the fact of Charles' sworn obligations cannot be doubted, all the more, however, can be doubted the details of the alleged content of the handed down oaths. Again, everything has to be eliminated as invented, what Charles as "Roman King" has supposedly sworn to the "universal pope", for example the request for approbation. It goes quite without saying, on the other hand, that the Bohemian gave his papal friend and benefactor the sworn promise, to use position and power as German King as much as possible on behalf of the French church. As much as this was possible! We have to be clear on the fact, that Charles could not dream of immediately and at all cost force the French dogma on the German regional churches, to gallicanise Germany in the religious-clerical regard. After all, only just had any authoritarian ecclesiasticism and "secular" hierarchy been principally fought by Ludwig the Bavarian. In this situation, Charles' taken on obligations could only be: as King in Germany, first off to again favour and strengthen the existing *authoritarian church* Christianity as such, on the other hand, however, to fight and eradicate as Heretics all German church and priest enemies – i.e. the "free" Christians and the God-believers – with any means.

But King Ludwig the Bavarian was still alive, and he still had followers everywhere. Of his learned allies, Marsilius and Cesena may have died in the meantime, but Occam was still alive, and he instantly sharply rejected Ludwig the Bavarian's opponent, the "parson King" Charles. The citizens of the coronation town Aachen, much like those of all free and Imperial towns, did not want to know anything of the parson King, either, and kept the gates shut for him. Therefore, Charles deemed it best at first, to follow the further development in Germany from abroad (namely from France and Italy).

Then suddenly, on a hunting trip, Ludwig the Bavarian died. After this "stroke of luck"[VI], Charles marched into Germany with an in Bohemia gathered army, and now, a swing of the mood became apparent. It turned out, that after the loss of their chief, many previous opponents were prepared to join Charles, and to acknowledge him as King. Peter Roger's pupil could now demonstrate, that he had learned a great deal in terms of diplomacy in Paris and Avignon. Truly, the parson King had firmly memorised one of the main teachings of the French national popedom: win yourself friends with the mammon! Acting according to this principle, Charles has indeed more bought than conquered Germany. We have to only open the pages 93, 95, 98, 112, 114, 159, 170, 174, 187, 231 in Werunsky, in order to realise, to what extent the King had handed out the golden "hand cream" to all sides. (W., II) In the final rounds, money played a weighty part also with two of Charles' counter-Kings, who were successively nominated by the Bavarian party after Ludwig's death: they had their abdication paid with significant sums by Charles.

To try everything else before the iron was Charles' diplomatic principle. How he was able to exploit for his purposes the affair of the *False Waldemar* (which is of course also plenty forged over), can be looked

[VI] The *King* dies on a *hunting trip*? Considering how many of the famous and ruling folks have died "just at the right time" (e.g. certainly JFK, Mozart, Schiller, Luther, Barschel, Möllemann, probably Pilsudski, to name but a few) over the centuries, this smells like a Freemason job to me.

up in the history books. Now, on the side of the Bavarian party, there stood initially the influential Count Palatinate Rudolf as well. By a clever move, Charles succeeded in making the Count Palatinate his friend, and by that, to break up the Wittelsbacher Electors' party: the King, who in the meantime had become a widower, married the Count Palatinate's only daughter Anna.

In many cases, the Royal parchment effected, what perhaps the golden hand cream with many German Electors and towns failed to achieve. King Charles gratuitously dished out his privileges everywhere. It is plain to see, that in this way, one was able to splendidly support the *secular* strengthening of the priesthood "the cold way". It was for example quite meaningful to confer upon a *cleric* the *secular jurisdiction*. However, how do things stand regarding the *authenticity* of Charles IV.'s documents? Answering this question is crucial for assessing just how much the history of the parson King has been falsified. The answer is this: all documents of this ruler, too, have been going through the re-forging branches of the great falsification action. Namely, with Charles' document treasure, we bump into the forgery black marks so well-known to us. 1. Sometimes, the dates of a document do not match the relevant information of a writer. 2. Oftentimes, the great distance of the locations where the documents were issued, does not match the limited time, i.e. the distances are strikingly great, partially impossible. 3. Not rarely, cases turn out, "where the King has not been at the named location on the entered day, but shortly before or after".[13] 4. Cases, "where the Emperor has been in the named location neither on the entered date, nor shortly before or after". (H., p 51) Most peculiar is document no. 1552, allegedly from the 4th of May 1353, "where Charles indicates… to the council of Strassburg his in Ofen performed wedding, which, according to all the news, was celebrated in the following *June*." (H., p 51) 5. Contradictions between "original document" and registry entry. (NA, Vol. 43, p 585/586) These are obvious signs of the falsification having occurred, the way they have copiously been discussed in the Book *The Falsification of German History* (and in *New Proofs*...) The result of an examination by Gutjahr sounds suggestive: "From a number of 1400 documents in German language from the Imperial chancery… I found only 55 documents overall, which match the customs prescribed (!) and performed by the chancery itself."[14]

5. Enormous strengthening of the "secular" priesthood under the parson King

All political events of the 14th century, by the existence and workings of the priesthood, were estranged of their by God wanted destiny – racial preservation and supporting the growth of the volk – and forced, openly or veiled, to services for pan-folkish extraterrestrial ideals. We will only arrive at the knowledge of the last motives of all significant political actions of those decades by posing, at every important point, the question: which clerical-priestly interest is behind it? This also applies to the so-called instances of "public peace", geographically and temporally limited "alliances", with which the history of that time is practically lousy.

Now, I do not perhaps get the idea of denying, that with the mass-like implementation of such "public peace" instances, secular-political ambitions have *also* played a part. The purely political may have even formally dominated the performance of such regional alliances. However, on the part of the "regional churches", it would have been an incomprehensible neglect of just *those* means, which were the most suitable for the realisation and strengthening of their dogmatic-hierarchical ambitions, had they not exploited such political regional alliances in support of the "church". If we have a look at the contract parties of such alliances, we almost always notice one or more "bishops" as members of them. If we further consider, that the dogmatic-clerical submission of the people, initiated by the hierarchy of the different partial churches, had to invariably lead to discord and division, to attack and defence measures, then, the springing up of local "federations" and the union of like-mindeds becomes also intelligible for clerical reasons. Such federations could be formed by the attacking churches as well as the attacked ones (God-believers and free Christians), they could be public or secret. It is also certain, that some of these federations represented real "*public peace*", i.e. armistices of fighting parties. Now, if King Charles favoured – taken in the literal sense – such public peaces, why, he even joined some of them, then, he did by no means betray the church's cause: in a territory of armistice, priesthood's *achieved* influence could also be immensely *solidified* by legal (legislative) measures of the King.

By a record, which in 1386, the town of Ulm has allegedly sent to the friendly town of Speyer, we are being pointed to a remarkable connection of entities: "Numerous Electors had supposedly brought up a "public peace", called the "Faim", which was growing day by day… Faim courts have been installed secretly."[15] Vehme researcher Lindner comments on this: "In his shock and suspicion, the reporter confuses true and untrue things. Since in Northern Germany, the public peace also used (!) to be called vehme, his aroused imagination confuses these with the free courts." (L., p 459/460) Lindner has quite failed to realise, where the problem actually lies, namely in the peculiar fact, that, and why, the public peace was *also* called vehme (in Northern Germany)! Things, phenomena, which, by their nature, have nothing in common, are not "usually" mixed by term or name. So, in truth, the vehme is of course nothing but a *secret* public peace federation. It is the parson King Charles, who in 1349 "gives the earliest hint at a true secret with the court and jurors". (L., p 481) Tradition is hinting at more still: Charles has, as a clever politician, looked after staffing the vacant chairs of the vehme. In a diploma from 1349, he authorises a *cleric* to determine the sheriffs of the secret court.[16] Here is not the place to carry out a thorough critical discussion of the interesting problems of the "secret court", especially since the vehme gains its actual significance only with the end of the 14th century (after the completed foundation of the Roman universal church!). Thudichum has recognised, that the vehme courts have supposedly equally been secular Heretic courts; they have indeed *also* been; even if nothing of this on the vehme is to be found in the (falsified!) sources! But the sources give away enough, anyhow. "For the 25th November 1371, Charles has given to the archbishop of Köln, the bishops of Münster, Paderborn and Osnabrück as well as the Count of the March, a secret privilege, called "public peace", which

authorised them… to have every prisoner hanged without being heard by the "holy" vehme courts depending on them."[17] If they were secret, public peace was simply used to called "Faim".

Besides golden "hand cream" and privileges, King Charles understood to utilise open and secret federations as well for his purpose – strengthening of the priesthood's power and eradication of the free Christians and God-believers as Heretics. Naturally, "Heretic" counter-federations, inasmuch as was under Charles' control, were dissolved. For a certain reason, Northern and Middle Germany must have been quite a particular eyesore to the King. In those areas, there were still great masses of God-believers and free Christians! In the interest of Niedersachsen's [Nether Saxony's] (!) clergy, the tradition has Charles point a decree "against the encroachments of the lay people and especially the town authorities, who, by arbitrary laws (!), curtailed the rights of the church, prevented the acquisition of worldly possessions, ignored excommunication, took possessions of clerical goods and put taxes on them, violated clerical sanctuaries."[18]

Naturally, "history" sends Charles on the "Rome journey" as well, in order to have him fetch the "Roman Emperor's crown" from there. The reader knows abundantly already, what the story is with Rome back then, and the alleged "Roman" coronation to Emperor of the German Kings before the 15th century. It is therefore very smart and careful, that also most of the "contemporaries" report nothing at all on Charles' alleged Rome journey. The "original" of the work of the only "eyewitness" of these invented Roman coronation events – it goes without saying! – has vanished. There may exist a copy from the 15th century – i.e. from the time of the falsification action! – but the "quality of the text is not gratifying. The writer has in some parts not understood his model source at all". In many places, there is a "downright nonsensical text". (NA, Vol. 38, p 240)

We must concern ourselves a little more thoroughly with one legislative grand deed of King Charles. This is the famous King election law of Nürnberg-Metz from the year 1356, called the *Golden Bull*. Actually, something monstrous happened back then, something previously allegedly outrageous and unprecedented. Namely, for the first time in the (falsified) German history, a *written* Imperial Constitutional law! Who would not know from "history", that the German Kings and reigning Princes of the Middle Ages – so quite to the opposite of the clever "universal popes"! – placed no value at all on *written things*! Allegedly, all medieval rulers avoided written things like it was devil's work. It was already much to ask of the German Kings, that they would have to issue documents for others. Ideally, they would not have tolerated any scribbler around them for such useless, foolish waste of time. If something has to be written at all, then only the utmost necessary things! We German Kings are meant to install registries and archives? We Kings would not dream of such nonsense! May the stupid popes trouble themselves with such useless things – not we. Thus spoke all German Kings of the Middle Ages – on the pre-condition, that we want to gullibly believe "history" to the letter. And thus it came to pass, that up to the times of King Charles, still no *written* Imperial law on the German King's election existed.

In Nürnberg and Metz, the Parson King has not decreed a brand new election law, tradition patronises us. Regarding the by name fixed *seven Electors*, he allegedly already found a firm tradition in place. Only certain insecurities had to be eliminated, the way such things had turned out, amongst others, as the result of the usual inheritance division with the secular electoral votes. We are primarily interested in the question: *is the tradition of the Golden Bull,* the way it is presented in the preserved specimen, *genuine or forged*? A preliminary question first: *can* the tradition of the legal work even *be* genuine? Since of course the law had supposedly been decreed in 1356, it has been created *before* the epoch of the great falsification action. That means however, that the Golden Bull *must* have invariably gone through the hands of the fathers of the soon after beginning falsification campaign. Now, in the presented case, of all things, should the original tradition have remained *untouched*? If we are therefore a priori permitted to assume with the highest degree of probability, that the presented specimen of the Golden Bull are forgery fabrications, then, this assumption becomes a certainty, if simply certain peculiarities can only be explained via the assumption of falsification.

As the oldest issues, the following specimen of the Golden Bull are preserved: B (the so-called Bohemian, from the Imperial chancery), and four Electoral ones, namely T (Trier), C (Köln), M (Mainz) and P (Pfalz [Palatinate][VII]). Additionally, there are two more specimen, namely F (Frankfurt) and N (Nürnberg), which are from a slightly later time, however, and which supposedly represent copies of B.

First off, if we have a look at each specimen individually, then, in detail, the following things are striking: "T and C have numerous erasures"; so, they have subsequently and systematically been thoroughly corrected, which is in the order with writings. But strangely, in C, "especially those mistakes, which have been consequently (!) made front to end, [have] been left standing, just like many gross misunderstandings that were difficult to correct."[19] So, the corrector of C acted according to the principle: hang the little thieves, let the big ones get away![VIII] Wherein the text deviations of C are sometimes outright "nonsensical".[20] And how do things stand with the other specimen? P, "by the copyist's arbitrariness (!), [is]… disfigured in many places." (Ha., p 452) Not infrequently, a word has been left out (!) in M; so, the writer of M has also worked flightily. "If flightiness is indubitably to be blamed here, it still strikes, that in numerous other (!) places, M and T jointly show the same gaps (!)." (MIÖG, p 103) As the reader can already see now, that one main characteristic of all Electoral issues is the *faultiness*, that is, a faultiness which strangely makes connecting threads from one specimen to the next. About the writer of C, we still hear, that he "wrote a text, which was oftentimes changed only by flightiness, but never disfiguring its meaning." (Ha., p 451) We now involuntarily stop here; because, what did we just read there? A changing of the text by *flightiness*, which is *meaningful* nonetheless!! What wondrous psychology of the writer of C! To the readers of my works, however, such

[VII] This 'Palatinate' thing has two different meanings: 1. the Kaiserslautern area 'Pfalz' (which is referred to here), and 2. generally, it denotes a region, not unlike a (small) county, but that could be anywhere in Germany, which would then be ruled by a 'Count Palatinate'.

[VIII] German proverb: 'die grossen (thieves, criminals in general) fängt man, die kleinen lässt man laufen' = 'you catch the big ones, and let the little ones get away'. So, the corrector has done the exact opposite here.

paradox psychology is no longer anything new: they also know what is behind it (namely the fathers of the falsification action!). And now, the most carefully produced specimen, the Bohemian B. This, too, is not quite free of mistakes. We hear there: "Two of the Electoral specimen… M and P… are closer to B, with which they have namely several striking mistakes (!) in common, and which the two other Electoral specimen… C and T… avoid."[21]

The researchers have in vain racked their brains over the mystery question: just what did the *original* of the Golden Bull look like, of which surely all preserved specimen must be copies? Or is perhaps B the original? No! Although for example M and P, with certain text peculiarities, are very close to the Bohemian specimen B, they could nonetheless *not* have been derived from this B. That means, that B could *not* have been *the immediate model source* for the copies M and P, "because in the details, they yet too often deviate from this text". (Z., p 176) The textual relations of the preserved specimen – which after all, stem from the original script, and thus, carefully copied, must all be *equal* in their *wording*! – is quite a tricky one. According to Zeumer, regarding the deviations in the text, M and P stand together against C and T. However, Lindner now finds, that by no means M and P, but M and T are more closely related. This researcher has carried out still further observations on the textual relations of all scripts of the Golden Bull, and declared: "Conspicuously however, C as well supports in individual places M and T against P and B. Finally, even M, T, P, C together make front against B.!" (MIÖG, p 104) Not exactly short and to the point, that means: "… that not only none of the preserved… specimen can be considered the actual original of the Golden Bull, but also, that neither to Nürnberg, nor to Metz, any text was present, which would have had the status of an original in the sense, that it was officially regarded as the only competent one, and as such, would have been the basis… for copies in the Imperial chancery. At least two different (!) texts were… used… for the production of the so-called Bohemian of the four Electoral specimen." (Z., p 178)

A very mysterious affair: an *original* of the Golden Bull did actually not exist, or rather, not only *one* competent "original" script was extant! But *at least two* writings of the King Election law were allegedly present in the Imperial chancery as model sources for the copies; so, at least two *different* originals! No bristling up will help us here, because the examination of the textual relations necessarily leads to this surprise conclusion. (Always gullibly assuming of course, that the specimen of the Golden Bull, the way they are presented, are *genuine*, untouched scripts!) Allegedly, none of the involved placed any value on producing an official *uniform text* of the important law. There were simply two or three textually different concepts (or whatever one wants to call the model sources), and every Elector and the Imperial chancery itself) could now choose, after which "concept" they wanted their copy to be issued. On the one hand now, this copy taking went about most flightily: "The faultiness of the by *seal*… authorised authentic specimen demonstrates a high degree of carelessness." (Z., p 177) On the other hand, however, we hear, that also great care was taken, because some specimen have been systematically and thoroughly corrected. The copies were even compared with each other! Yet again, some "consequent mistakes" were left standing! A mysterious story for sure.

It would be a waste of time to spend any more time on the specimen of the Golden Bull, because for my readers, the solution to all the riddles is plain to see. The yet again grossly featuring *deviation on purpose* ("deliberate contradiction"), the way it reveals itself in the "sensical[IX] flightiness", strikingly proves, that all specimen of the Golden Bull are learned fabrications from the great falsification action. In this case, the deliberate contradiction does not apply to the aspect of the content, but to that of the form (textually)[X] for one good reason. Just in order to stress this right away: the Golden Bull is *not* in *all* decrees flat invented, but despite the performed purposeful partial re-forging of the contents[XI], by and large, it delivers real public law. After all, the law was meant to be applied in *practice*, not perhaps merely, much like the grand heap of the falsified medieval records and documents, to be forged for the archives as a *learned* falsification product. But why then did the King Election law even have to be *falsified*? Among other things, because the decrees of the Golden Bull do in truth *not* stem *from the year 1356*, *not* from Charles IV.'s times at all, but represent a legal state from only the following century. That is to say: *the Golden Bull (as such)* has been *backdated*! Now, in order to understand the necessity of such backdating on the part of the forgers, we must focus on the purpose of our law.

The Golden Bull regulates the German Kings' election by fixing in writing the right of the seven Electors regarding the election proceedings. That seven, of all numbers, namely three clerical and four (quite particular) secular Electors were permitted to "kiss"[XII] the King, had during Charles' times been the accepted legal custom already for a long time, or so hints tradition. At least since 1257, just *these particular seven* reigning Princes, before all remaining Imperial reigning Princes, were granted the prerogative to elect the German sovereign. Previously, *all* Imperial reigning Princes possessed and exercised the right to vote! As late as the year 1200[XIII], that was the case; and back then, certain reputable clerical and secular reigning Princes

---

[IX] As opposed to 'nonsensical', i.e. this one *does* make sense; why is 'sensical' not in my dictionary?

[X] This is one time where Kammeier loses me completely: I can't get away from the idea, that the words 'content' and 'form' should switch position to make sense of this sentence...

[XI] ... confirming the point made in the previous footnote. Along with the already highlighted 'boners', and a couple of minor ones, this is giving me the impression, that nobody proof-read the scripts before/during printing.

[XII] After struggling in vain to find *any* instance of the by Kammeier used 'kiesen' in any of my 'modern' resources (dating back to the late '1800's), I remembered Thomas Carlyle having shed some light on this in Vol. 1, p 77, of his eight-volume work on Frederic II. (the Great) of Prussia, originally published around 1859-65:
"Fürst (Prince) I suppose is equivalent originally to our noun of number, First. The old verb 'kieren' (participle 'erkoren' still in use, not to mention 'Val-kyr' and other instances) is essentially the same word as our 'choose', being written 'kiesen' as well as 'kieren'. Nay, say the etymologists, it is also written küssen (to kiss,—to choose with such emphasis!)…"
Just so I could write this footnote, I went with the quoted etymologists and 'kiesed' 'kiss' instead of 'choose'; also, 'choose' would not make all that much sense in the quotation marks that Kammeier originally chose for "kiesen". ☺
By the way, this quote is one reason why I have almost consistently translated 'Fürst' as 'reigning Prince', and 'Kurfürst' (Kierfürst?) as 'Elector'; the few instances of 'Prince' left in the translation are non-reigning ones, as far as I was able to make out. Also, the modern German verb 'küren' (~ to bestow some sort of a title), and the noun 'Kür' ('free-style' e.g. section of figure-skating or gymnastics) fits this neatly.

[XIII] Well, this looks like another 'boner': the orig. 'noch' indicates 'as *late* as', but two sentences earlier, talk was of 1257 being the *early* landmark date, so perhaps the text should read '1300'? That would be *my* best idea.

(just these future seven exclusive Electors) had only one prerogative when *casting* their Electoral votes: they were allowed to cast their vote *first*. Then, over the course of around half a century, the development of the right to vote must have practically scrambled towards a certain direction. Because, as mentioned, in the year 1257, *all* Imperial reigning Princes found themselves "legally" excluded from the business of electing the King – except those *seven* prerogative Electors, who had thus become *exclusive* Electors. A surprising development; thus concede, a little alienated, our historians as well. But since our relativistic researchers are devout slaves of the tradition, they simply accept the "fact" of the development of the Election law to be concluded from the sources. However, for every unbiased thinker, the described "development" is a mystery: namely, we are not at all able to find out from the else so talkative (falsified) sources, which political forces had *effected* such "development". The development progresses in empty space, or, if you will: by "decree" of destiny! In rough reality, however, a political development (of the Election law) does not progress by "decree", but under the pressure of political forces. Just how could all remaining Imperial reigning Princes (there were very reputable and powerful ones amongst them) have the important right to vote snatched from them without resistance? On this, profound silence of the sources. Some sources indicate, that the seven privileged Imperial reigning Princes have eventually become the only Electors, because they manage so-called arch-offices. That may at least still somewhat explain the old prerogative with the vote-casting, but in no way the *elimination* of all remaining Imperial reigning Princes without their resistance. Bloch talks of a "logic of the facts", which had brought on such elimination, but alas, alas: the "facts" are nowhere to be found![22]

Tightly connected with this is a further psychological mystery. Let us assume once more, that the tradition is authentic, then, the contemporaries of that "development" must have been accurately informed, since when and how the exclusive right of the election by the seven Electors had arisen. But now we experience a massive surprise: the "contemporaries", of all people, are beginning to rack their brains over the probable origin of the Electordom, and are telling the world wondrous *fairy tales* about it. Simply read, what Buchner has compiled on the Electors' fable.[23] Over something that everybody had to know, suddenly, enormous insecurity and speculation set in! If it were even necessary to look for further evidence for the performed systematic falsification of late medieval history: here, we have again gotten our hands on a wonderful psychological proof.

The particular fact, that the Golden Bull has *not* originated from the Imperial Diets to Nürnberg and Metz in the year 1356, is now involuntarily conceded by the falsified tradition itself. Namely, we hear: "It is remarkable, how exceedingly minute the traces are, which the legislative act has left behind in the records from that same time." The contemporaries have "almost throughout, passed it by without taking any notice. Even the persons present on the Imperial Diets, where the law had been published, seemed to have barely noticed anything of the significant events, of course besides the immediately involved circles… In the report given by the [present!; K.] Strassburg council messengers shortly after Christmas 1356, all sorts of things are

mentioned, but not a word about the law published on the same day!... Of the simultaneous chronicle sources, only one mentions the Nürnberg legislation, that is, in the most sparingly manner." (Z., p 3)

6. On the way to the second German-Italian extra-popedom

We skip one decade of Charles IV.'s term of reign. By a second "Rome journey" of the parson King from the year 1368, announced by the tradition, our attention is again being steered towards the conditions in Italy.

The *Visconti* of *Milan*, whose rule stretched across numerous towns of the Lombardy, were still the leaders of the anti-French movement in Upper Italy. They were in constant, ever-changing fights with neighbouring towns with "Guelphish" leanings. So, despite the curia of Avignon, now as before, having powerful allies in Italy, the so hotly pursued dogmatic-clerical influence of the French national church was halted again and again as a result of the unbroken attacking power of the Milan opponent. In that respect, it is not surprising to us when we hear, that in earlier years, King Charles, the zealous protector of the French priesthood, had also been at loggerheads with the Milanese. As early as 1356, through his for Italy appointed General Captain Markwart, Charles had the two Visconti Bernado and Galeazzo summoned to take responsibility for their "encroachments against church and Empire", amongst other things, "because they have bestowed clerical benefits from own authority, imprisoned and tortured clerics, and… had… not published the sentences inflicted upon the Heretics." Back then, the Visconti responded with a harsh letter, in which they have given Markwart the title of robbers' Captain and arsonist. It is not our task to critically follow in detail the again and again flaring up fights of the parties. We can content ourselves with the bare fact of these fights *for and against* (secular) *priesthood Christianity* (especially against France's popedom), but we want to still mention the in these fights prominently figuring so-called "evil societies". The sources portray these "societies" as often numerically strong, independent military bands of mercenaries and filibuster companies. In the year 1366, "Urban [the back then French pope; K.] decreed a big bull of punishment against the societies roaming in Italy, in which he diffusely described their horror deeds: their… hostile acts against towns and places of the Roman church (!)…" (W. III, p 341-343)

It turns out that the "*evil*" companies are indeed nothing but armed forces of the *church opponents*, especially opponents of the French church. However, when such societies fought *in the service of the curia*, they were naturally welcome as *good* auxiliary forces; because the French popes, too, have drawn up such "bands" in Italy. Only, the tradition in such a case talks merely of "papal troupes". Thus, Innocenz VI. of

Avignon has sent cardinal Aegidius Albornoz to Italy as his commander-in-chief, who was meant to re-conquer the almost completely lost "church state" for the "universal pope". In truth, Albornoz' task consisted of, jointly with the Italian friends (towns), forcing the obstinate church opponents into submission. The sources announce, that the French cardinal = commander in chief, with the weapons of diplomacy and war, was able to book great successes especially in Middle Italy, and there is no reason to generally doubt this. Without a question of course, the Visconti weren't constantly winning, but, the way the tradition reports, they have certainly often been forced to an armistice or peace negotiations by temporary failures. Thus, shortly before the arrival of Albornoz, a peace between Florence and Milan had supposedly been concluded. However, if in connection with this, it is claimed that back then, the "universal pope" had addressed the desire to the Milan "rebels and Heretics", that they "ask forgiveness" of him for their church-disgracing deeds, in order for him to grant them "absolution from their church punishment", then, seen from the viewpoint of our findings, the purpose lie is easily established.

We now return to King Charles. About him we hear, that he has supposedly discussed some pressing issues in a face-to-face meeting to Avignon with pope Urban V., such as fighting the "evil" societies and the Visconti. The main point of the discussions between Charles and Urban was allegedly a different one, however. Namely, the sources report, that the King has supposedly suggested to the "universal pope" the *return from Avignon to Rome*. "The peoples and states of Europe viewed the permanent stay of the curia in Avignon with great displeasure. Namely, Germany attributed the wrongs suffered under John XXII. and his successors to the influence of the neighbour enemy in the West, and Charles knew best just how tightly France and popedom stood together." (Li. II, p 70) And with this, we again stand – assuming the medieval tradition to be principally authentic! – before that great religious-psychological mystery: how is it possible, that the Christians of that time did not spend a thought nor care about the so cruelly violated tradition of faith of the Sedes Romana by "popedom's Babylonian exile"? If we take history for "authentic", then, this religious-psychological mystery remains insoluble. As we know, however, "history" of the Middle Ages is simply *not* authentic! Thus, in reality, the believers could not have been worried about such troubles. Thus of course, the general axiom of my book *Mystery Rome*… was : the re-settlement of the "universal popedom" from Rome to Avignon is an invention! A catholic universal church with a universal pope and a papal world capital city Rome did not yet exist before the 15th century! The information, that the peoples and states of Europe had wished for the *alleged return* of the "universal popedom" to the "by God wanted eternal seat of popedom", to Rome, *not at all* for *religious* reasons, but for the quite *secular* reason of freeing popedom from its political bonds in France, thus becomes exceedingly telling.

Never has the "universal popedom" been "transferred" from Rome to Avignon; from which thus follows, that it could not have been "re-settled" back to Rome, either! Therefore, Charles' alleged efforts to effect pope Urban's return to Rome as well as of course the by the sources reported temporary return of Urban to Rome itself, are a pack of lies. Thus, Charles has never been in Rome together with Urban. Furthermore,

the axiomatic consequence of our central finding is provided by the fact: Urban's successor in Rome, Gregory XI., cannot, as "history" is trying to convince us, have finally re-located "Peter's chair" to Rome in the year 1377, either! Much like Urban, Gregory has not seen a town Rome, and can therefore not have died, nor been buried, in the "world capital city" by the Tiber.

Why then is history trying to dish us up the lie of the re-settlement of the "universal popedom" to Rome, and in connection with this, the lie of Urban's and Gregory's presence in Rome? In the falsified tradition, why did the pope have to return to Rome *just now*, in the year 1377, of all years? The history falsifiers were *forced* to such purposeful fairy tale by a momentous event unfolding in Italy back then, whose true nature had to be *concealed* at all cost. *This event is the second, and this time very much permanent, nomination of a genuine Italian-German extra-popedom*. (We will momentarily return to the foundation and monstrous significance of the second Italian-German popedom.) It was impossible for the forgers to concede the fact of an independent German-Italian popedom of their own (much as they could not permit themselves to regard the French popedom as a genuine extra-popedom). After all, one general tendency of the medieval history falsification is: there were no independent extra-popes in the Middle Ages; it was only ever one *universal popedom* with the chair in Rome that existed! After all, universal popedom, as early as around the year 1300 allegedly existing for many centuries already, is actually *the* great purpose lie of the falsification action. *Regarding the French popedom*, the purpose was simply met by the fact, that the "universal popedom" was simply "transferred" to Avignon. Then, when the Italian-German extra-popedom had to also be reconciled with the general purpose, it was quite the forgers' natural choice, that in the falsified tradition, the "universal popedom" was now "transferred back" to Italy again, to Rome. Thus, the affair gains the desired appearance, as if the French as well as the German-Italian extra-popedom had always been the "of old" existing "universal popedom". Because it was *impossible* to represent the in the year 1378 implemented second Italian-German popedom as *completely independent* from the in Avignon residing alleged "universal popedom" – as was truly the case – *that is why*, in the history fictionalisation, the "universal pope" had to "return" from Avignon to Rome *one year before*! Thus, the new extra-popedom would appear as *the* "universal popedom".

We have just named a historical main event of the closing 14th century: in the year 1378, for the second time, an Italian-German extra-popedom has been implemented and placed opposite of the French national popedom. To the reader, this fact means at least a surprise, because in it lay founded, that the French national church must have suddenly experienced a fiasco with their expansionist ambitions in Italy and Germany. We will thus have to conclude, that this result is yet based on the pre-requisite of a general, *enormous turn of the mood*, and a situation *disadvantageous* to France. And indeed, tradition open-heartedly admits to this sensational turn.

Since as early as around 1360, we sense with the parson King the first secret signs of a modification of his views on the "secular" priesthood. Quite in contrast of course to his passed-on Royal rival Ludwig, Charles, who in the beginning favoured the priesthood of the regional churches, also regarding their "secular"

desires for power, has supposedly decreed a memorandum to the German "bishops" in the year 1359, "in which he admonished the latter to enact a reformation of their diocese clergy dedicated to knightly games and traditional attires, and miscellaneous secular customs, and in case of non-observance, … threatened with notifying the pope, and with the authorisation of the secular reigning Princes to confiscate their clerical income". (W. III, p 212) Naturally, in this memorandum, the "notice to the (French!) pope" drops out as a forgery; but Charles' following principal behaviour confirms to us, that a real change of attitude reveals itself here. Various experiences could have effected the King's change of mind. However, the main impulse will likely have been the realisation, that it more and more turned out to be *impossible* to subjugate the priesthood of Germany's regional churches to the authoritarian influence of the French popedom. Why, not even *that* could be achieved within Germany: the implementation of an independent German national church mimicking the French model source! Charles' efforts remained fruitless, because eventually, the German reigning Princes and the German people *were* yet *not intent on handing over the state to the priests at their discretion*. The great idea of Ludwig the Bavarian's times, which had been alive in the admonition and demand: restriction of the priestly authorities to the purely spiritual realm, was despite "hand creams", fire and sword not entirely banned from this world; to the contrary, over time, it gained spiritual ground everywhere, and demonstrated its canvassing power anew.

So, around 1370, almost less than ever could there be any talk of a unification of the German regional churches with the French national church to one universal church. Before his second "Rome journey", during his presence in Avignon, Charles will not have left any uncertainty on the true state of affairs in Germany towards pope Urban, either. In that regard, however, the individual churches had experienced a significant strengthening, since by the violent measures of the last decades, and privileges and hand creams, by now, wide circles of the previous "free" Christians (and perhaps some God-believers, too) had been "reconciled" with the existence and actions of an authoritarian priesthood. But especially *these* newly gained ones will have, openly or covertly, worked towards more urgently raising the demand for exclusion of the clergy from any secular power. Pressed by necessity, the clerical heads as well had to make allowances for such mood of their believers, so that from their side, too, Charles' French friendliness did not meet approval throughout. How big the tension between secular and clerical "Electors" on the one hand, and King Charles on the other, were back then, is highlighted by details on the occasion of the alleged second "Rome journey" (in reality, Charles' renewed campaign to Italy). There we hear, that the archbishops of Mainz and Trier had refused to support Charles' campaign against Milan, and that Duke Stephen of Bavaria fought on the side of Bernado Visconti in the flaring conflict. Back then, even the Count of the Palatinate Ruprecht terminated the close friendship that he had maintained with Charles for years.

Now, the ultimate break between the ageing King and the French-clerical ideals of his youth falls into the years 1374 to 1376. We may view Charles' "reconciliation" with the German Electors as an external indication of the radical turnaround. The reconciliation, i.e. a furthermore friendly cooperation, was effected

on the pre-condition, that the King declare himself prepared to support a newly emerging plan of the clerical heads of all German and Italian regional churches. This plan aimed at nothing less than *the renewed nomination of a German-Italian extra-popedom*. (We will hear more of this momentarily.) In return for Charles' accommodating stance on the church issue, the Electors, on their part, declared themselves prepared to elect during Charles' lifetime his son Wenzel as the future Royal successor. Here as well, however, the Electors acted in their own interest, because with this premature election as a precaution, they secured for themselves a future German sovereign, who, like his father, would be a protector of the newly to be nominated extra-popedom. On the 10th June 1376, young Prince Wenzel has supposedly been elected in Frankfurt, and on 6th July, crowned in Aachen. If we again assume for a few moments, that the tradition is *not* systematically falsified, then, the interesting question emerges: how did the "universal pope" in Avignon position himself towards the plan of Wenzel's election? After all, we have heard so often from the sources, that the curia claimed the right of approbation, why, it wanted to see any election depending on the prior affirmation obtained from them. Thus, the falsified tradition has pope Gregory XI. demand of Charles 1. the latter may ask the curia for permission for the election, and 2. ask for confirmation of the elected. Most remarkable is, what the sources have King Charles reply to the messenger of the alleged ideas of the "universal pope", namely: "With emphasis, he explained to the envoy, how irate the mood [against the French pope!; K.] in Germany be. The pope could not know the malevolence… of many masters, and if he [the pope] were not to be careful, the Emperordom would meet an enemy of the Roman church. He might want to consider, which houses are loyal to him." (L. II, p 90) So, Wenzel's election is being carried out against the will of the "universal pope". Despite this, in order to not let the alleged rights of the "universal pope" appear diminished, "history" has the King together with the pope present a little comedy. *Belatedly*, it says, Charles has yet made the concessions desired by the "universal pope". "If [pope; K.] Gregory stubbornly refused to acknowledge Wenzel as King, then he [Charles] would issue a writ, which was to be backdated to before the election, in which he asked Gregory for permission…, and the pope had the relevant counter-document issued [backdated; K.]." (L. II, p 91) Hauck is rightfully wondering over the naivety of this comedy: "How could the curia conceive it to be possible to eradicate from existence a world-famous (!) fact by a couple of forged letters?"[24] However, it was not Charles nor Gregory who were forging, but these "contemporary" documents are learned products from the later falsification action.

How did *Italy* position itself towards the plan of a new German-Italian extra-popedom? With this, we mostly think of the Italian Guelphs and primarily of Florence, the long-standing "warmest girlfriend" of the French national church. After all, to Avignon, the new popedom meant a slap in the face and the final farewell. Was the unbelievable conceivable, that Florence could one day *apostatise* the Avignonian popedom? Quietly, the turnaround announces itself. Then, as early as the year 1356, we perceive from the sources a dissonance in the political concert of the two partners Florence-Avignon. Back then, the Florentinians refused to join a league to fight the "evil" societies, in line with the request from Avignon. The pope was so enraged about this refusal, that he angrily commented on the unruly daughter Florence. "The Florentinians", he

supposedly said, "testify to their devotion towards the [French; K.] church only with words, they do not want to perform their real duties, why, they even prevent others from serving the church." (W. III, p 338) Thus, the old friendship has yet gotten a crack. And then, only about five years later, when Gregory XI. had ascended to the French papal throne, the barely conceivable yet became an event: all of Upper and Middle Italy stood up in joint defence against the curia of Avignon, and the *head* of this revolt movement was – *Florence*!! Florence appeals to all Italian towns to unanimously throw off the yoke of the "*secular*" (French-oriented) priesthood! And Florence was successful with its passionate appeal: eighty towns joined the league *against* Avignon, and the former conquests of Albornoz were lost again almost completely. "Almost everywhere, a hatred against the secular (!) power of the popedom and the secular (!) possessions of the church emerged… In Florence, the inquisition building was torn down, the church goods confiscated, and the priesthood threatened for life and limb." (Lo., p 378)

The sources tell us that *one* town did *not* join the revolt against the "universal church". That was supposedly Rome! Now, we know even without this announcement, why Rome back then could not have possibly stood up against anybody: because a town Rome did not even exist back then. Especially the back then only just invented "world capital city" was *not* allowed to behave as an enemy of the "universal church" *in the falsified history*, either; but the forgers were *forced*, especially at that time and on paper, to attribute to the "town" by the Tiber a particular loyalty to popedom. Why? Why, because *now*, the formerly "abducted" universal papal throne had to be "transferred back" from Avignon to Rome. And then, the "returning" pope had to be (in the fictionalisation) *welcome* in Rome, too! And thus, Rome could not participate in the rebellion.

What forced the forgers especially at *that* point in time however, to have unfold the (invented) transfer back of the "universal popedom" to Rome, is already known to us. It is the sensational event, which caught the attention of the christian world now: *the renewed nomination of a* (this time permanent) *Italian-German extra-popedom*. Naturally, the tradition was not permitted to reveal how things were standing with this. On the other hand, the forgers, according to their general purpose, had to be careful to represent the conditions *so*, that the fatal new popedom of their own was presented and interpreted to posterity as the "of old existing universal popedom". So, the falsified tradition is banging it into our heads: only *one*, one *universal* popedom had supposedly existed for many centuries. It had supposedly, by unfortunate accidents, been "relocated" from its God-wanted seat, Rome, to Avignon, but in 1377, again "returned" to the christian world capital city by the Tiber. The truth sounds different: *the French national popedom has*, for as long as it existed, *always remained at home in Avignon*; and the in 1378 by Urban VI. in Italy (but naturally not in the void Rome!) implemented new popedom represents *a completely independent, genuine extra institution* of the unified German-Italian regional churches, now under one head.

7. From the alleged "schism" to the foundation of the Roman universal church

In church history, the year 1378 is known as the point in time of the outbreak of the alleged "*schism*" of the previously unified, of old existing "universal" popedom. This old, "universal popedom", we are told, has just "returned" from its Avignonian exile to Rome, when the "unified" Roman church split into two parts as a result of pope Urban VI.'s guilty behaviour: the schism has come over Christianity.

We know, that this entire paper tradition complex of the alleged schism of the previously "unified universal church" is an enormous web of lies. Regarding especially the alleged *origin* of this schism, I only have to remind the reader of the Book *Dogma Christianity*…, whose first chapter presents extra proof for the fictionalisation on a psychological basis.

Now, just what did *really* happen in the year 1378? In the previous chapter already, we have recognised the true nature of the highly important event; Italy's and Germany's regional churches jointly put up an own pope at the helm of their hierarchy. Urban VI. is the name of the first representative of this second German-Italian popedom. This Urban is that Bartholomew of Prignano, who has allegedly been elected in Rome by predominantly (from Avignon to Rome returned) *French* cardinals in 1378. Indeed, this is of what "history" is most happily trying to convince us, and this is *how it has* been lying to the tradition-devoted relativistic history researchers successfully for centuries. In truth, the French national popedom has always remained where it was at home, in France: therefore of course, no cardinals of this *French* extra-church in *Italy* (naturally, least of all in the void Rome) could have elected a pope (let alone a German-Italian one)! Urban's electors have been Italian and German clerics. Unfortunately, we are no longer able to historically-critically determine the exact circumstances and details of Urban's elevation, thanks to the exceedingly thorough falsification of all qualifying sources. We know, why the election could *not* have taken place in Rome; it is impossible to establish however, *where* it was really carried out. Speculating on vague possibilities leads us nowhere here; we have to once again content ourselves with the bare fact.

However now, important conclusions on the *significance* of this supreme herderdom can be drawn from the *bare fact of the existence* of a German-Italian extra-popedom. In its nature, this new popedom must have been fundamentally different from the French one. If this new popedom had been merely meant to equally copy the French one, then it would remain unintelligible, why Italy's Guelphish church Christians (Florence) eventually so energetically raised up against the French popedom yet. Especially the general, radical turnaround in fundamental clerical views, revealing itself in the revolt of a French-friendly town such as Florence, proves the occurrence of the harsh opposition to Gallicanism. The rejection was not perhaps aimed at the persons, the relevant owners of French popedom, but, as even the falsified sources still clearly reveal, at the idea, which the Avignonian curia represented and propagated: the "secularity" of the French

hierarchy. And it was just this *rejection* of any intermixing of clerical and secular authorities that made the idealistic peculiarity of the new anti-French popedom. It is in connection with this, that the entire *dogmatic basis* of the German-Italian popedom, too, was peculiar, i.e. different to that of the French national church. But how? Then, has now indeed a *joint dogmatic platform* been created in Germany-Italy, too? This question has to be answered affirmatively. From the mere existence of new supreme herderdom, there follows with necessity a created joint dogma basis for the hierarchical top institution. Because in case of a *missing* dogmatic concord, just this necessary *understanding* and the *unanimity* of the various involved German-Italian priest circles on the nomination of a joint supreme herder would not even have been possible. As we have to conclude from various indications, however, equally only a dogmatic *minimal* program was created by compromise, which allowed for particular-dogmatic reservations to exist for all involved partial churches. So, we are not yet to think of a *fully defined* German-Italian uniform dogma (a true counter-piece to the French national one). The individual regional churches were neither forced nor willing to completely give up their dogmatic-hierarchical independence. It has to even remain unclarified, whether there were Italian and German partial churches, which were even still (temporarily) standing aside in anticipation, and who wanted to know nothing of a uniform supreme dogma. Only the sword of the secular arm could have effected the implementation and securing of an absolutely obliging, unified foundation of belief (superseding any particular dogma). However, with the political situation in Germany (and Italy), there was no dreaming of such forced measures by the state.

When the German-Italian extra-popedom became a reality in the year 1378, the French national popedom, it goes without saying, continued existing with the seat in Avignon. So now, two separate clerical institutions existed quite independently of each other in Europe. The christian spiritual soil has produced two completely separately standing and living "trees". For the fathers of the history falsification action, the question emerged now: since we must, according to our general purpose, pass off the Italian-German separate popedom as the already of old existing universal popedom, "returned" from Avignon to Rome – *then, how do we explain the yet next to it still existing French national popedom that cannot be denied out of existence?* The solution was really not hard to find. So: (in the falsified tradition), one has the allegedly now in Italy residing "universal popedom" *split*, and then (in the fictionalisation), sends the one part again swiftly across the sea to Avignon! Behold, we now have indeed *two* popedoms, one in Italy and one in France, quite in the way things were standing in reality. But by having the French supreme herderdom *split* from the Italian-German "universal popedom", i.e. simulating a *schism*, we have splendidly satisfied our general purpose of the united Roman universal church existing of old for centuries! – Truly, this solution was not hard to find.

If tradition announces: the *French* popedom of the alleged schismatic Clemens VII. was supported by France, Spain, Scotland, and from Italy, the French sphere of influence of Naples; Upper and Middle Italy, Germany and England stood by Urban's Italian-German popedom – then, this bipartition by and large represents the true historical situation. The initial efforts of the rivalling parties succeeded in here and there

recruiting further churches of other countries for their side. Since 1378, two hostile christian camps, distinguishable by the membership of the "obedientiary" [clerical obedience] to the one or the other upper clerical civil servant, were facing each other. The separating trench should run through Christianity for thirty years. And then, in the year 1409, no longer quite unexpectedly, that big event took place that for one full century had been so hotly desired primarily by the French national church (and the theologists of Paris University): the *dogmatic-hierarchical universalism*! The objective longed for was not achieved on a straight path, but now, just in this year 1409, it was yet accomplished despite all setbacks. From 1378 onwards, one has worked on filling the separating trench for a good thirty years on both sides. At long last, in the year 1409, the barrier fell under the motto: *To a united over- and universal church by dogmatic-hierarchical union of the two church groups*!

On that day, when, on the council to Pisa (1409), representatives of the previously hostile obedientiaries jointly elected a supreme herder, *a real universal pope*, the Gallican idea of a *catholic universal church* became a reality.

Thus, Alexander V., as the elected called himself, is the *first catholic universal pope*!

I must reserve for later the interesting task of critically assessing the ever renewed attempts at reconciling the alleged schism, the way the falsified tradition has represented it under the ban of its general purpose. At this point, only a few significant facts shall be highlighted.

The actual driving force of the union of the church groups was – *Paris University*! We could even call the council of Pisa the theological faculty of Paris University, temporarily re-located here, and reinforced by the participation of all nations: besides many cardinals and bishops, 300 doctors of theology[XIV] have supposedly gathered in Pisa! We understand the presence of these theologists from all parts of both obedientiaries very well, when we consider, that of course, as a fundamental pre-requisite for the union and the nomination of a universal pope, the *creation of the necessary universal dogma* (uniform dogma!) had to be realised at the council of Pisa! No universal pope without universal dogma! (The records of the council, the way they exist, have naturally been falsified in line with the purpose of the "schism"!)

At the Pisa council, the *re-location of the new universal popedom to Rome* has also been decided upon. The universal pope was meant to have his residential seat at a *neutral* place (*not* in France or Germany!); and thus, after clever scheming and considering all circumstances, the jealousy of the peoples, in a manner of speaking, necessarily agreed upon the ruinous void by the Tiber. First however, the planned world capital city of Christianity had to by and by be built yet.

[XIV] 300? Doctors of theology? Could those be the equivalent 300 to whom Rathenau referred? I wouldn't get this idea if 300 were a commonly used figure, such as 11, 33, 666 etc., but apart from one film (which may well connect with this, too), this is only the third time that this figure has stuck out to me. On the two first occasions, the magnitude of the events matches the standing of those 300 (firstly those mentioned here, and secondly, Rathenau refers to the 1897 Zionist congress in Basel from which the so-called 'Protocols' emerged, as far as I remember).

At the council of Pisa, Gallicanism has ultimately morphed into Romanism. Certainly: the theoretical constitution of the catholic over- and universal church back then in Pisa meant at first in practice not a full success yet in the sense, that now *immediately all* church circles of both groups would have placed themselves under the authority of the over-pope. Such general quick turnaround, and the realisation of the idea, has likely not been expected by the in Pisa gathered ones, either. We know of course, that after the election of the universal pope, the two group popes, on their part, would not dream of abdication. The sub-popes were able to remain in office, because, for the time being, they simply possessed a great followership, who wanted to know nothing of an over-church or an over-pope. Thus existed indeed *three* popes in Christianity; and still many years passed under stubborn fighting up to the absolute implementation of the idea of the universal popedom.

Furthermore, the council of Pisa also marks the *start date of the by now tightly organised, and from now on systematically carried out great history falsification action*.

The next book will be concerned with: *The falsification of the history of primeval Christianity*.

In order to put the reader in a position to comprehend as necessary the critical thrust against the history of *primeval Christianity* beginning in the next book, I will already give a very brief introduction here. This problem concerns the written basis of christian dogma formation: the holy script, especially the *New Testament*.

For tactical reasons, I have treated the New Testament in the traditional sense as the "of old" fixed variable of the solidified written canon of the christian church. However, this pre-requisite must now no longer remain critically untouched. Thoughtful readers may have already asked themselves the question: just which "*church*" has created and sanctioned the written canon of the New Testament, if a Roman universal church had not even existed until the 15th century? We know that before the 15th century, there only existed independent, dogmatically very different *regional churches*. There, in the embittered dogma fights of these rivalling churches, could a fixed, generally binding canon *even originate at all*? In other words: should thus perhaps the New Testament, the way it exists today, have only been created, when the different partial churches united to one universal church (at the council to Pisa)? These are the questions, whose answers must be tackled in the following book.

Endnotes

[1] Denifle-Weiß – Luther und Luthertum [Lutherdom], Vol. II, 1909, p 303, abbreviated in the text as {'D.'}

[2] Riezler – Geschichte Bayerns [History of Bavaria], Vol. II, 1880, p 378

[3] G Erler – Deutsche Geschichte [German History], Vol. III, 1884, p 368, {'E.'}

[4] Hefele – Conziliengeschichte [History of the Councils], Vol. IV, 1867, p 509 f.

[5] Zeumer – im neuen Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde [in the New Archive for older German Historical Science], Vol. XXXVII, p 234 and 237 {NA}

[6] Karl Müller – Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern mit der Kurie [… Fight with the Curia], Vol. I, p 356 {M.}

[7] Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken [Sources and Research from Italian Archives and Libraries], Vol. XIX, 1911, p 159

[8] R Moeller – Ludwig der Bayer und die Kurie im Kampf um das Reich [… and the Curia in the struggle for the Empire], (Eberings historische Studien [Eberding's historical Studies], book 116, 1914, p 56

[9] E Werunsky – Geschichte Kaiser Karls IV. [History of Emperor Charles IV.], Vol. I, 1880, p 321 {W.}

[10] Archiv für Östereichische Geschichte [Archive for Austrian History], Vol. XXXV, 1865, p 260 {A.}

[11] I Loserth – Geschichte des späteren Mittelaters [History of the later Middle Ages], 1903, p 290 {Lo.}

[12] Nachrichten d. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen [News of the Society of Science to Göttingen], 1883, p 243 f.

[13] A Huber – Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Kaiser Karl IV. [The Registers of the Empire under Emperor Charles IV.], (Regesta Imperii), Vol. VIII, 1877, p XLIX {H.}

[14] E A Gutjahr – Die Urkunden deutscher Sprache in der Kanzlei Karls IV. [The Documents in German Language in Charles IV.'s Chancery], 1906, p 18

[15] Th Lindner – Die Veme [The Vehme], 1888, p 459 f. {L.}

[16] Damberger – Synchronistische Geschichte [Synchronistic History], Kritikheft zu Bd. XV [Book of Critique to Vol. XV], p 7

[17] F Thudichum – Femgericht und Inquisition [Vehmic Court and Inquisition], 1889, p 73 f.

[18] Th Lindner – Deutsche Geschichte unter den Habsburgern und Luxemburgern [German History under the Habsburgs and the Luxemburgians], Vol. II, p 34 {Li.}

[19] O Harnack – Die ältesten Ausführungen der Goldenen Bulle [The oldest Issues of the Golden Bull], (in Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte [in Research on German History]), Vol. XXIV, 1884, p 451 f. {Ha.}

[20] Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichte [Messages of the Institute for Austrian History], Vol. V, 1884, p 104, footnote 2 {MiÖG]

[21] K Zeumer – Die Goldenen Bulle Kaiser Karls IV. [Emperor Charles IV.'s Golden Bull], (Quellen und Studien z. Verfassungsgeschichte d. deutschen Reiches [Sources and Studies on the Constitutional History of the German Empire]), Vol. II, 1908, p 176 {Z.}

[22] H Bloch – Die Stauffischen Kaiserwahlen und die Entstehung des Kurfürstentums [The Stauffen Emperor Elections and the origin of the Electordom], 1911, p 366

[23] M Buchner – Die Entstehung und Ausbildung der Kurfürstenfabel {The Origin and Development of the Elector Fable], 1912

[24] A Hauck – Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands [Germany's Church History], Vol. V, Pt. 2, p 669